

18th July 1953]

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“ I received a copy of the representation only yesterday and I have called for the exact particulars. As such I think it is not necessary to dispose of this item now.”

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—“ No, Sir.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member gave me the representation yesterday and I immediately passed it on to the Hon. Chief Minister. The Chief Minister has called for relevant particulars. I think the motion could be discussed on Monday. Is that agreeable to the hon. Members.”

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—“ Yes, Sir.”

III.—GOVERNMENT BILL.

THE ANDHRA STATE BILL, 1953—*cont.*

MR. SPEAKER :—“ We were discussing yesterday . . .”

SRI M. PALANIANDI :—“ Sir, as the Council would be meeting from Monday (20th July) onwards, I would like to know what has happened to my adjournment motion.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member could have come to my Chamber. I could have explained.

“ Yesterday we were discussing clauses 3 and 4 of the Andhra State Bill.

“ It had been represented to me yesterday that I had not allowed any opportunity for the Kannadiga friends from Bellary district to speak on the Bill. Hitherto I have been allowing hon. Members to speak on party basis but now I shall allow hon. Members in view of this representation, to speak on linguistic basis. (Laughter.) The hon. Member Sri Sirasappa may now speak.”

SRI A. GOVINDASWAMI NAYAGAR :—“ ஸார்; திங்கட்டிழமை யாவது இந்த அவசரத் தீர்மானத்தை எடுத்துக் கொள்ளுவீர்களா என்று நான் கேட்கிறேன்.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ நீங்கள் இப்பொழுது கேட்பது பார்லிமென்டரி முறை அல்ல. தயவு செய்து என்னுடைய ரூமுக்கு வாருங்கள். உங்களுடைய வாதத்தை நன்றாகக் கேட்கிறேன். இல்லென்ற சப்ஜெக்டைப் பற்றி பேசும்போது மற்றொரு சப்ஜெக்டை இங்கு கொண்டு வந்து நீங்கள் பேசினால் அது பார்லிமென்டரி முறையல்ல என்று சொல்லுவார்கள். தயவு செய்து பார்லிமென்டரி முறை பிரகாரம் நடக்கும்படியாக நான் உங்களைக் கேட்டுக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

* SRI IJARI SIRASAPPA :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, my hon. Friend, Sri Pai was telling the House yesterday that the Kannada people here on the floor of the House are in a minority and as we have seen, a number of Andhra friends have spoken about this Bill and only a few of the Kannada Members had a chance of saying anything upon the Bill and that is why I requested

10-50
a.m.

[Sri Ijari Sirasappa]

[18th July 1953]

you, Sir, to give us a chance to represent our view point to the House in order to meet the points that have been put forth by our Andhra friends regarding the Bill. We would have very gladly supported the amendment of the Government if only the clarification was given to us regarding leaving out Bellary from this Bill. Before this I had already represented to you that the question of Bellary and Bellary taluk has already been settled by the Misra award and I feel that there is no use re-opening that question now once again because that would lead us nowhere. About this a number of my Andhra Friends have referred to the holding of a plebiscite, referendum and things of that sort and I would like to ask Sri Prakasam what is it that is left yet about that question. I wish to ask Sri Varadachari and other Friends what sort of representation is now left for them to make before any Committee or to the Government of India. They have already represented what they have

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, may I know if the hon. Member is making any personal explanation.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I believe he has not spoken yesterday. Has he spoken yesterday? ”

SRI IJARI SIRASAPPA :—“ No, Sir.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ He has not spoken yesterday. This is the first time he is speaking.”

* SRI IJARI SIRASAPPA :—“ My hon. Friends seem to feel that the question of Bellary has been kept in abeyance by the Prime Minister. If they wanted somebody to go into that question in the manner they are suggesting, they could have asked for it earlier. We, the Kannadigas of that area thought that the area is a Kannada area and the Andhras had no right to claim it as an Andhra area and even thought of boycotting Misra. He came and the Andhra people waited in deputation on him, presented memoranda and they were heard by him. In that connexion as if to fortify his case, my hon. Friend Sri Varadachari was telling the House that the resolutions passed by panchayat boards and municipalities were not taken into consideration by him. But let me say in that connexion, Sir, that a number of panchayat boards and municipal councils did pass resolutions and forward them to Sri Misra on the Bellary issue and, if I am correct, more than seventy per cent of the panchayat boards and municipalities are in favour of Bellary going into the Kannada area. Sri Prakasam was telling the House that the question of Mysore does not arise regarding this Bill. I would like to tell our veteran Leader, Sri Prakasam, that the Andhra State was to be formed with the undisputed Telugu areas and all the while the district of Bellary comes under the disputed area. I am sure he knows that even earlier. There were disputes, there are disputes now and there will be disputes to-morrow also regarding the district of Bellary if it goes into the Andhra area. My hon. Friend was in the Partition Committee during 1949 and 1950 and he knew about it and they had turned their gaze towards Bellary

18th July 1953]

[Sri Ijari Sirasappa]

after they had to lose Madras City. There are some good buildings in Bellary and some regional offices are stationed there and for that reason, it is not right that they should try to snatch away Bellary from the Kannadigas. Mention was also made to the revenue records and it was said that the records had been maintained in Telugu for the last one hundred years. That I submit, Sir, is an injustice that the people of the area have been suffering for the last two hundred years, not for hundred years alone. Let me take the case of Madras City; the records are all maintained in English; can Mr. Prakasam say now that because the records are all being kept in English, the British can claim the City and the City belongs to Britain. Stretching that point further, the records in Pondicherry are kept in French and those of Goa in Portuguese and so should the territories be ceded to them and we should have nothing to do with those territories. Let it be remembered that the records are maintained in Telugu and everything is carried on in Telugu in spite of our requests. The criterion of the language of the records will not help my Andhra Friends. I am afraid that cannot be the criterion or the basis for saying that it is a Telugu area and including it in the Andhra State. Let me say, Sir, that all these things arose after they had decidedly to lose the City of Madras. Sri Varadachari was saying that in Bellary there were a number of regional offices and it would be very convenient for the Andhra Government to run the administration. The existence of buildings also, I submit, Sir, cannot be the criterion because it is the will of the people that should be the guiding factor. The people of Bellary wanted to go away to Mysore and they prefer to be with their Kannadiga friends in Mysore rather than join the Andhra State or to remain in the residuary State with the Tamil friends. Representations have been made to Sri Misra, the majority of the Kannada-speaking people sent their representations through various organizations and even a sub-Committee was appointed by the Andhra Provincial Congress Committee to represent their case before Misra and on a full consideration of the various representations he has given his award and that must settle matters and I request Andhra Friends not to raise that question once again. Sri Thimma Reddi suggested that the Boundary Commission should also go into the question of the three taluks as well as of Bellary. But I must say, Sir, that we, the people belonging to the Kannada area, have claims even in Anantapur and Kurnool districts and as suggested by some friends there are even Kannada areas in the Tamil area also but in order not to increase the unpleasantness between the Kannadigas and the Andhras, we are keeping quiet and I would in a like manner urge my Andhra Friends to be kind enough and to be large-hearted enough to wait for the Boundary Commission to take up and decide the question so that they would be giving over what is really Kannada area to the Kannadigas for the Karnataka State that should be formed. It was pointed out by one Friend that Madakasira is a predominantly Kannada taluk and it could as well be given over to the Mysore State. I say, Sir, we are not

[Sri Ijari Sirasappa]

[18th July 1953]

hurrying up with those matters and we want that the Boundary Commission should deal with the matter and if it is convinced as it will be that it is a Kannada area, it will be bound to say that it ought to go to Mysore State. All sorts of complications could be brought in by making mention of other areas like the Kalyandrug area, Dharmavaram, etc., but the fact is that we do not want to bring in such complications because it will give room for more problems which is likely to hinder progress or the formation of other linguistic States. I would, therefore, like my Andhra Friends to wait for the Boundary Commission leaving out the question of Bellary taluk which has been declared by Justice Misra to be a predominantly Kannada area. The leaders of Karnataka and also the Andhra State have already come to an agreement not to raise the question of the seven taluks which are predominantly Kannada. Why should the Andhras go back upon past agreements and why should they be fighting shy for the three taluks going under the purview of the Boundary Commission? If the Andhra Friends go on raising the issue of the taluk of Bellary even here on the floor of the House when the award has been specifically given upon it, there will be no end regarding the Bellary issue. They made their representations to the Government of India and the Government of India made their announcement and then they wanted a Commission to be sent and a Chief Justice to be sent and finally the appointment of Misra was announced and he came and heard, and found out that it was a predominantly Kannada area and decided that it should go with the rest of the six taluks to Mysore and now they want a referendum or a plebiscite. In the plebiscite if it is decided that the Bellary district should go to Mysore and not to the Andhra State, even then they may raise some other issue and say that they do not want to abide by the plebiscite. Therefore there will be no end to all these things. I suggest that they could as well leave off the Bellary issue for the present and wait for the Boundary Commission to decide upon the disputed taluks.

11
a.m.

"The people of the Bellary taluk are Kannada-speaking people who want to go to Mysore and also it is difficult for that taluk to be administered by the residuary Madras State. Mr. Prakasam was referring to that. Sir, hon. Members of this House and the Parliament, the Hon. Ministers of this Government and the Central Government are all servants of the people and the wishes of the people must be carried out. The wish of the people of Bellary that they want to join a territory which is a Kannada territory, must be carried out and the leaders must accept it and must act according to it. Mr. Prakasam himself wants that the wishes of the people must be carried out and the wishes of the people of Bellary are that they should join with their Kannada brethren who will help in forming their own State in the near future. There is nothing wrong in the Government of India announcing that the seven taluks of the Bellary district should go to Mysore which is a Kannada State. Therefore, there is no point in Mr. Prakasam raising any objection to the inclusion of any reference to Mysore in this Bill. We cannot

18th July 1953] [Sri Ijari Sirasappa]

force the people of Bellary to remain in the residuary Madras State when they do not like to remain there and there is no use in doing so. The wishes of the people of Bellary must be carried out.

"Regarding this Bill, I have already stated that if only the Bellary question is removed from this amendment, we, the Karnataka people, will gladly support the amendment brought forth by the Government. Yesterday also, I wanted the Hon. Chief Minister to clarify the position and if it is clarified that the Bellary issue is beyond the jurisdiction of this amendment and a definite assurance is given to that effect, we will unhesitatingly support the amendment."

(At this stage the Deputy Speaker occupied the Chair.)

SRI K. VARADACHARI :—"Sir, I rise to make a personal explanation with regard to the remarks of Mr. Vinayagam yesterday. I could not catch his actual remarks at that time. But I have since gathered that what he said was that I had issued a pamphlet during the elections, saying that the whole Tiruttani Constituency should go to Tamilnad and all that. I am sorry that he is either misinformed or if he has really seen the pamphlet he has not read it closely. If he does not produce the pamphlet in question which I issued during the elections, he will have to resign his seat in this House, according to his challenge."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—"I accept the challenge."

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER :—"Mr. Ramalingam . . ."

SRI K. V. RAMESAM :—"Mr. Deputy Speaker, the principle underlying the amendment is undoubtedly good . . ."

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER :—"I have called Mr. Ramalingam to speak."

* **SRI S. RAMALINGAM** :—"கனம் உதவி சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, ஆந்திர மாகாணம் ஏற்படவேண்டும் என்பதைப் பற்றியும் எல்லையில் ஏற்படக்கூடிய தகராறுகளைத் தீர்ப்பதற்கு எல்லைக் கமிஷன் நியமிக்கவேண்டும் என்பதைப் பற்றியும் தஞ்சாவூர் அபிப்பிராயத்தைச் சொல்லுவதற்கு ஒரு தீர்மானம் இப்பொழுது சபையின் முன்பாக இருக்கிறது. அதற்கு சர்க்கார் தரப்பில் கனம் சி. சுப்ரமணியம் அவர்கள் ஒரு திருத்தத்தைக் கொடுத்திருக்கிறார்கள். அந்தத் திருத்தத்தில் ஆந்திர மாகாண எல்லையில் இருக்கின்ற சில எல்லைத் தகராறுகளைத் தீர்ப்பதற்கு ஒரு எல்லைக் கமிஷன் வேண்டும் என்றும் இருக்கிறது. ஆனால் சபையில் அங்கத்தினர்கள் பேசிய வகையில், தமிழ் பிரதேசத்திலிருந்து வந்த அங்கத்தினர்களும் சரி, ஆந்திர பிரதேசத்திலிருந்து வந்த அங்கத்தினர்களும் சரி, கன்னட தேசத்திலிருந்து வந்த அங்கத்தினர்களும் சரி, எல்லைக் கமிஷன் ஏற்படுத்தவது பற்றி யாருக்கும் ஆட்பாட்டை இருப்பதாகத் தெரியவில்லை. ஆனால் சர்க்கார் தரப்பிலிருந்து வந்த திருத்தத்தைப் பார்த்தால் அதில் பல விதமான சந்தேகங்கள் ஏற்படுகின்றன. அதாவது எந்தந்த இடத்தில் தான் பெருவாரியான அங்கத்தினர்களும் புரிந்து கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். நானும் அப்படியேதான் புரிந்து கொண்டிருக்கிறேன். இந்த சர்க்கார் திருத்தத்தில் இருப்பதாவது 'for making recommendations as to any adjustments that may be necessary in respect of the boundary of the

[Sri S. Ramalingam]

[18th July 1953]

Andhra State in those areas.' ஆந்திர எல்லைத் தகறறுகளை தீர்ப்பதற்கு என்று இருக்கிறது. உண்மையில் ஆந்திரர்கள் பெல்லாரியிலிருந்து சில பகுதிகளை தங்களுடைய பிரதேசத்தில் சேரவேண்டியதாக இருக்கிறது என்ற அபிப்பிராயம் அவர்களில் இருக்கிறது. அதைப் போலவே தமிழர்களுக்கும் சித்தூர் ஜில்லாவிலிருந்து சில பகுதிகளை தமிழ் ஜில்லாவிற்கு சேரவேண்டி இருக்கிறது என்ற அபிப்பிராயம் இருக்கிறது. சித்தூர் ஜில்லாவில் ஆறு தாலுகாக்கள் தமிழ் நாட்டில் சேர வேண்டும் என்ற அபிப்பிராயம் சிலருக்கு இருந்து வருகிறது. ஆனால் மசோதாவில் சித்தூரில் சென்னை ராஜ்யத்திற்கு எந்த விதமான உரிமையும் கிடையாது என்று நிர்ணயித்து விட்டார்கள். ஆகவே அந்தத் தகறறுரை சுமுகமாகத் தீர்த்துக்கொள்வதென்றால் ஒரு எல்லைக் கமிஷனை நியமித்துத் தீர்த்துக் கொள்ளலாம். இது தான் எங்களுடைய அபிப்பிராயம். ஆனால் இந்த விவாதத்தை புரிந்து கொள்ளாமல் ஏதோ ஒரு திருத்தம் கொண்டு வந்திருக்கிறார்கள். உண்மையிலேயே அந்தத் திருத்தம் சபையின் அங்கத்தினர்களுடைய அபிப்பிராயத்தை பொருள்படுத்தக் கூடிய முறையில் இல்லை என்பது தான் என்னுடைய அபிப்பிராயம். மேலும் இந்தத் திருத்தம் சம்பந்தமாக காங்கிரஸ் கட்சியில் எந்த விதமான சரியான முடிவுக்கும் வராமல் இஷ்டப்போல் போடச் செய்யலாம் என்ற முடிவுக்கு வந்திருப்பதுத் தெரியவருகிறது. நேற்றைக்கு கனம் முதல் மந்திரி அவர்கள் பொது விவாதத்திற்கு பதில் அளிக்கும் போது ஒரு செர்மன் (Sermon) அதாவது ஒரு வாதம் சொன்னார். மாகாணத்தைப் பிரிப்பது என்பது பாஷாவாரி அடிப்படையில் மட்டும் பிரிப்பது இல்லை. அதற்கு பல காரணங்கள் இருக்கின்றன. அவைகளைக் கொண்டு நிர்ணயிக்க வேண்டி இருக்கிறது. அப்படியே தான் தாங்கள் சென்ற பெங்களூர் காங்கிரஸ் கூட்டத்தில் முடிவெடுத்திருக்கிறோம் பாஷாவாரி மாகாணப் பிரிவினை பாஷாவாரி அடிப்படையில் மட்டும் அல்ல, இன்னும் பல அம்சங்களை கவனத்தில் வைத்துக் கொண்டு தான் இந்த முடிவுக்கு வந்திருக்கிறோம் என்று குறிப்பிட்டார். அது மட்டுமல்ல; அவர் பேசும்போது கம்யூனிஸ்ட் கட்சியைக் கூட தாக்கி பேசி இருக்கிறார். அதாவது கம்யூனிஸ்ட் கட்சி கூட பாஷாவாரி மாகாணத்தைப் பிரிக்கவேண்டும் என்று ஒரு முடிவிற்கு வரக்கூடிய நிலைமை ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது என்றும் அதில் ஏதோ இருக்கிறது என்றும் குறிப்பிட்டார். காங்கிரஸ் கட்சியில் இந்த பாஷாவாரி மாகாணப் பிரிவினையில் ஒருமுகமான அபிப்பிராயம் ஏற்பட முடியவில்லை. ஆகவே இந்த திட்டத்தில் ஏதோ ஒரு ஒட்டை இருக்கிறது என்பதாகத் தான் தெரிப வருகிறது. உண்மையாகவே அவர்களுடைய திட்டத்தில் சரியான அபிப்பிராயம் இருந்தால் அந்த திட்டத்தில் ஏற்றுமை கூண்டிருக்க முடியும். பிறகு ஒரு சரியான தீர்மானத்தை சபையின் முன் வைத்திருக்க முடியும். ஆகவே இந்தப் பிரிவினைக்கு பாஷை அடிப்படையில் மட்டும் இல்லை. வேறு காரணமும் இருக்கிறது. உண்மையான காரணங்கள் இருந்தால் இந்த வசையில் மாகாணத்தை பிரிக்க யோசனையை கொடுத்து இருக்கலாம். சரியான அபிப்பிராயம் இல்லாததால் தான் இஷ்டப்படி போட்டுக்கு விடலாம் என்று சொல்லிவிட்டார்கள். இப்பொழுது கொண்டு வரப்பட்டிருக்கும் திருத்தத்தின்படி தமிழர்களும் ஆந்திரர்களும் சண்டை பிடித்துக் கொள்ளலாம், தெலுங்கர்களும் கன்னடியர்களும் சண்டை பிடித்துக்கொள்ளலாம். அந்த முறையில் தான் இந்த சர்க்கார் திருத்தம் வந்திருக்கிறது. ஆகவே கம்யூனிஸ்ட் கட்சியிலிருந்து வந்திருக்கக் கூடிய திருத்தத்தை ஏற்றுக் கொண்டால் அது திட்ட வட்டமாக இருக்கிறது; அது ஆந்திரர்களுக்கும், தமிழர்களுக்கும், மைசூர் கன்னடியர்களுக்கும் நல்லதாக இருக்கும். Residuary Madras-க்கும் மைசூருக்கும் இருக்கக் கூடிய எல்லையையும் இன்னும் மற்ற தகறறுகளையும் தீர்த்துக்கொள்ளலாம். அந்தந்த கிராமங்களில் தொடர்ந்தால் போல் இருக்கக் கூடிய பாஷாவாரி பிரதேசத்தை அந்தந்த பிரதேசத்துடன் சேர்த்துக் கொள்ளலாம். அதன்படிதான் எல்லையை நிர்ணயிக்கவேண்டும். அந்தந்த கிராமங்களிலுள்ள மக்கள் எந்தந்த பாஷையைப் பேசுகிறார்களோ அந்தந்த பாஷையைச் சேர்ந்த பிரதேசத்துடன் சேர்த்துக் கொள்ளலாம். அந்த அடிப்படையில் எங்கள் திருத்தம் அமைந்திருக்கிறது. எங்கள் திருத்தத்தை எடுத்துக் கொண்டால் எல்லையில் இருக்கக் கூடிய தகறறுகளை கண்டிப்பாக தீர்க்க முடியும். இருக்கும் சண்டை சச்சரவுகளை சுமுகமாக தீர்க்க முடியும்.

18th July 1953]

[Sri S. Ramalingam]

இல்லாவிட்டால் கண்டை சச்சரவுகளை சுமுகமாக தீர்க்க முடியாது. இப்பொழுது எல்லையில் தகராறுகள் இருக்கின்றன என்றும் அதை சுமுகமாகத் தீர்க்க வேண்டும் என்றும் எல்லோரும் பேசுகிறார்கள். ஒரு சிலர் மட்டும் தங்ளுடைய கட்சியைப்பற்றி சொல்லிக்கொள்வதற்காகத்தான் பிரமாதமாக ஆட்சேபணைகளைக் கிளப்புகிறார்கள். உண்மையிலேயே ஜனநாயக முறையில் பிரிக்க வேண்டுமென்றால் எந்தப் பகுதி மக்கள் எந்த பாஷையில் பேசுகிறார்களோ அந்தப் பிரதேசத்தில் தான் அந்தப் பகுதிகளைச் சேர்க்கவேண்டும். அந்தந்த பாஷையைச் சேர்ந்தவர்களை அதாவது தமிழர்களை சென்னை ராஜ்யத்திற்கும், தெலுங்கர்களை ஆந்திர ராஜ்யத்திற்கும், கன்னடியர்களை மைசூருக்கும் சேர்க்கவேண்டும். அதைத் தான் நிர்ணயம் செய்யவேண்டும். ஒவ்வொரு கிராமத்தையும் தனித்தனியாக எடுத்து அந்த கிராமத்தில் எந்த பாஷையை அதிகமாக பேசுகிறார்களோ அந்த பாஷை மக்களை கணக்கெடுத்து அதற்குத் தகுந்தாற் போல் இருக்கின்ற பிரதேசத்தில் சேர்க்கவேண்டும். அப்பொழுது தான் எல்லைத் தகராறுகள் இல்லாமலும் கண்டை சச்சரவுகள் இல்லாமலும் ஆந்திர மக்கள் ஆந்திர தேசத்துடனும், தமிழ் மக்கள் தமிழ் தேசத்துடனும், கன்னட மக்கள் கன்னட தேசத்துடனும் சேர்ந்து சுமுகமான முறையில் மாகாணத்தை பிரித்துக்கொண்டு எதிர் காலத்தில் தங்கள் தங்கள் அபிவிருத்திகளைப் பூர்த்திசெய்து கொண்டு சுமுகமாக வாழ முடியும். அப்பொழுது தான் அவர்களில் தேசிய உணர்ச்சி பெருகி, நாகரீகமாகவும், தங்களுடைய கலாசாரத்திலும், பொருளாதாரம், சலீல, முதலியவைகளில் தங்களுடைய நலனை பெருக்கக் கூடிய முறையில் தங்களுடைய ராஜ்யத்தை நடத்திக் கொள்ள முடியும். இன்றைக்கு சர்க்காருடைய திருத்தத்தைப் பார்த்தால் அவரவர்கள் கண்டை சச்சரவுகள் போட்டுக் கொண்டு மண்டையை உடைத்துக் கொண்டு மக்களை செய்து கொண்டிருக்கக் கூடிய நிலைமை ஏற்படும் போல் இருக்கிறது. எதிர் காலத்தில் தங்களுடைய எண்ணம் நிறைவேறாமல் இருக்கும்படியான முறையில் இருக்கிறது சர்க்காருடைய திருத்தம். ஆகவே சர்க்கார் தங்களுடைய திருத்தத்தை பரிசீலனை செய்து அவர்களுடைய திருத்தத்தை திட்ட வட்டமாக அமைத்து ஆந்திர தேசத்திற்கும் கன்னட தேசத்திற்கும் இருக்கக்கூடிய எல்லையை நிர்ணயித்து தொடர்ந்தாற் போல் இருக்கக்கூடிய பிரதேசங்களை ஒன்று சேர்த்து தனித்தனியாக தேசத்தை அமைத்து பெருவாரியான மக்கள் அவரவர்களுடைய பாஷைகள் இருக்கக் கூடிய பிரதேசத்தில் இருக்கும்படியாக எல்லை கமிஷனை அமைத்துக் கொள்வதற்கு ஒரு திருத்தம் கொண்டு வந்தால் அதை ஏற்றுக் கொள்வதற்கு ஆட்சேபணை இல்லை. இந்த முறையில் சர்க்கார் கவனம் செலுத்த வேண்டும். சித்தூரில் இருக்கும் தமிழர்களுக்கு கம்யூனிஸ்ட் கட்சியின் சார்பில் சொல்லிக் கொள்ளுகின்றேன். கம்யூனிஸ்ட்கள் தமிழ் நாட்டிலுள்ள ஒரு அங்குலத்தைக் கூட ஆந்திர ராஜ்யத்திற்கு விடப் போவதில்லை. அதைப் போலவே மற்ற தேசமாகிய ஆந்திர தேசமோ அல்லது கன்னட தேசமோ அந்த தேசத்திலுள்ள ஒரு அங்குல இடத்தையாவது நாங்கள் அதிகமாக கேட்கப் போவதில்லை. எல்லோரும் சுமுகமாக பிரிந்து போக தமிழரும் ஆந்திரரும் கன்னடியரும் ஆக மூவரும் சேர்ந்து உட்கார்ந்து சிந்தித்துப் பார்த்து சுமுகமாக ஒரு முடிவுக்கு வந்து அதை எடுத்துக் கொண்டால் மேற்கொண்டு நம்முடைய காரியங்களைச் சுமுகமாக செய்ய சாதகமாக இருக்கும் என்று சொல்லிக் கொண்டு என்னுடைய பேச்சை இத்துடன் முடித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

SRI H. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“ Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the Government of India have decided that the whole of Bellary taluk should go to Mysore State on the recommendation of Justice Misra but the same Government left it to the Andhra legislators of this House to decide on the location of the Capital of the new State. In the first of these instances a matter involving the location of one lakh and eighty thousand people of Bellary had been left to the decision of one man. There is no sanity or wisdom in this. I should like to deal with the report of Justice Misra in some detail. For the investigation of the linguistic

[Sri H. Ramalinga Reddi] [18th July 1953]

composition of the area, which was one of the terms of reference, Justice Misra took the 1951 Census figures as the basis. The Andhra section of the people contended that it was not a reliable census for various reasons put before him. If we compare the two sets of figures, one supplied by the Government as has been published, and the other supplied by the Census Department, it is evident that there is a difference of about 4 per cent. This is a fact which goes to show that it is not safe to rely on the 1951 Census figures. Perhaps, it was only on account of this that Justice Misra announced publicly that he would visit some of the villages for purposes of verification. There is also another fact that he himself has stated in his report, namely, that he was not satisfied with the material supplied to him by a large number of people not less than a thousand in number. He has also stated in his report that short of holding a plebescite it would be impossible to decide on which side the support of the people lay.

"In this connexion, I would like to refer to a fact which Justice Misra has overlooked, namely, the important resolution which had been passed by the Bellary Municipal Council. He says that it does not reflect public opinion. Though a number of panchayat boards in the eastern firkas of Bellary also had passed resolutions favouring the inclusion of Bellary taluk in the Andhra State, these resolutions also, he holds, do not reflect the opinion of the people concerned in those firkas.

"Lastly, a local Member of the Legislature, Sri Gangappa told Justice Misra that he contested the election on this issue during the last general elections. For this, the answer of Justice Misra was that the result of the election had not been decided on a linguistic basis as Sri Gangappa had issued a pamphlet that he would not harm the interests of the Kannadigas if he were to be elected and therefore the argument that it was fought on a linguistic basis did not hold good. The linguistic issue was there and the election had been decided on this basis. In addition to this, I am surprised that we have not been able to convince Justice Misra that the 1951 Census figures are not to be relied upon sufficiently.

"From the point of view of administrative convenience, Justice Misra says that Bellary should be included in Mysore State. The extent of a district in Mysore State ranges from about 1,900 square miles to 4,500 square miles. He therefore wants that Bellary should be included in the Mysore State as the headquarters of the six western taluks to be added to Mysore as there is no other proper place for the district headquarters.

"But, Sir, I would like to submit that if Alur, Adoni, Rayadurg taluks and the three firkas of Bellary taluk along with Pattikonda and Dhone of Kurnool, and Gooty and Kalyandurg taluks of Anantapur are formed into a district, it could be made into a sizable district with headquarters at Bellary.

18th July 1953] [Sri H. Ramalinga Reddi]

at the dam-site. Hospet is even now the headquarters of the Assistant Collector. A small township has come into existence at the dam-site and all the buildings required for the location of offices and for accommodating the staff can be found there. I am only surprised at the remarks of Justice Misra that there is not sufficient accommodation at the dam-site to locate the headquarters. In fact there are enough buildings there even to accommodate the temporary capital of the new Andhra State. One of the wishes of the Andhras was to locate the temporary Capital at Bellary town if it had been included in the new Andhra State.

“ I must submit, Sir, that if Alur and Adoni taluks are included in Kurnool district, the people of those taluks will be put to very great inconvenience and difficulties. From the point of view of administration of justice, these taluks—Alur and Adoni—contribute more than 50 per cent of the cases—civil and criminal—of the existing Bellary district. If these two taluks were added on to Kurnool district where judicial work is already heavy, we will be putting a great strain on the judicial administration of that district. Besides, with the exception of Nellore district, Kurnool is the biggest district in the Andhradesh. Hence there is every need to form a separate district including the taluks of Alur, Adoni, Rayadrug, Bellary, Moka and Rupanagudi firkas of Bellary taluk, Gooty and Kalyandrug taluks of Anantapur district, and Pattikonda and Dhone taluks of Kurnool district. From the point of view of revenue administration also, we have to take into consideration the fact that the work of the Revenue Department in Alur and Adoni taluks is very heavy as they are the rich revenue-yielding taluks of Bellary district. The people of those taluks will be put to very great difficulties and inconvenience if they are made to go to the revenue headquarters at Kurnool. Further, I am afraid that as the temporary Capital of the new Andhra State is proposed to be located at Kurnool, the revenue headquarters of Kurnool district will be shifted to Nandyal and this will result in causing more difficulties and inconvenience to the people of Alur and Adoni taluks. I therefore strongly plead for the formation of a new district comprising of the areas mentioned by me in the earlier portion of my speech with Bellary town as its headquarters.

“ Even from the point of view of cultural affinities, Bellary has got everything to do with the Rayalaseema and Circar areas. The name ‘Rayalaseema’ has been associated with the Rayalaseema Mahasabha which took its birth at Bellary. Before that the Rayalaseema area was called the Ceded districts area.

“ The commercial and business activities of Bellary are all connected with the rest of the districts in the Rayalaseema and the Circars and not with the Mysore State.

“ Bellary is also the birth place of the Andhra Nataka Kala Pitha Maha who had produced a number of dramas. Bellary is the seat of dramatic art, for the whole of Andhradesh.”

[18th July 1953]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member's time is over. Mr. Govinda Rao will now speak.”

* SRI K. GOVINDA RAO :—“ Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, when a new State is carved out, it is but natural that there will be disputes on both sides of the borders, as we see now. With regard to such disputes, the Communists' standpoint is that the border can be drawn only on the basis of contiguity, on the basis of language, with the village as the basic unit and ascertaining the will of the people on both sides of the border. In this connection, Sir, I must refer to the remarks of the Hon. the Chief Minister in reply to the debate on the general discussion. He was saying that the Communists are now supporting the national demand of the Andhra people because they are afraid they will lose their ground in the Andhradesh, if they do not support the nationality question, and that Marxism does not accept this nationality problem at all. With all respect to the knowledge of the Hon. the Chief Minister about everything on the face of the earth, I should say, Sir, very humbly that the less he talks of Marxism the better it would be for all of us. The nationality problem has been a subject-matter for discussion among all Marxist parties in the world for a very long time. In the recent past, every party is closely discussing this question. In the Soviet Union, a solution to this problem has been found for the first time by Marshal Stalin. The Soviet Union has been organized on the basis of nationalities and unity has been achieved in that country in spite of the fact that there are many nationalities there.

“ Coming to the amendments under discussion before the House, I would like to refer to the amendment moved by the Government in particular. We would have readily accepted the Government amendment if only the Government have stated that questions relating to the entire border line can be taken into consideration and there would have been no difficulty. But unfortunately the Hon. the Chief Minister said that certain disputes on the border would be taken into consideration and not all. This is the reason for the grave apprehensions in our minds. When the question of Bellary comes up, the Hon. the Chief Minister says, ‘ Well, Sir, in your own interest, do not jeopardise or spoil your case by asking me to specifically mention the name of Bellary in this connection.’ We are afraid, Sir, that the Boundary Commission will be appointed only with regard to disputes relating to Tirutani only and that other disputes will be left out. The Hon. the Chief Minister might have understood the position in a particular way. The amendment as suggested by the Government is very vague. To-morrow when the Bill goes up to Parliament, we do not know what the attitude of the Central Government will be. They may not know at all whether the Hon. the Chief Minister meant that all these questions were included in this general amendment.

11-30 a.m. “ We do not know what attitude the Central Government is going to take and if at all the Hon. the Chief Minister meant all

18th July 1953]

[Sri K. Govinda Rao]

these questions to be there in that general amendment and if in spite of that to-morrow it is left vague when the Bill goes to Parliament, there is no guarantee that this matter will come up at all, for consideration by Parliament. So we are very much doubtful whether the Boundary Commission to be appointed is only for the purpose of deciding the future of places like Tiruttani and not for deciding the disputes with regard to Kolar or Bellary or other areas. One might say: 'Sir, you are referring to Kolar. It is a question which relates to the formation of Visala Andhra'. Similarly, when certain members refer to the question of Berhampore in Orissa, then also it is said that it is a question of Visala Andhra and that it cannot be taken up now. It is but natural, Sir, that when a new State is carved out, all the claims of Andhras to the contiguous areas of Orissa, Hyderabad or Mysore come up for consideration. I know the claims of the Andhras, in particular to Parlakimedi area. If we go through the O'denell Committee's report prepared at the time of the formation of the Orissa State, we find that the entire estate of Parlakimedi, which belongs to the Raja of Parlakimedi and which is predominantly a Telugu-speaking area, was annexed to Orissa State on the ground the Raja happened to be an Oriya Raja, on the ground he happened to have some relations at Puri in Orissa and on the ground he was a liberal Zamindar who was looking after the interests of the peasants sympathetically. That was the argument advanced in the O'denell Committee's report. So it is but natural that portions which have been unjustly taken away from the Andhra State should come back to Visala Andhra. If one says that this is not the proper occasion to press for the formation of Visala Andhra, well, I can understand that. At the same time I should say that the question of the border areas between the Andhra State, the Mysore State and the residuary Madras State stands on a different footing. Now that the entire question is coming up, Sir, there should be no difficulty for the Government to take up the matter in right earnest and include at least Kolar, Bellary and the entire border area between the three States in the Andhra State Bill. There should be absolutely no difficulty to appoint a Boundary Commission for carving out the boundaries between these three States. The scope of the Boundary Commission should not be left vague. It must definitely be mentioned that the entire border area between these States should be taken up for consideration. If the Government are prepared to give such an assurance, then there will be no difficulty at all. Unfortunately Sir, the present form in which the amendment is given is not acceptable to us for the simple reason that we apprehend that it refers to questions like Tiruttani and nothing else."

* SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" Sir, we are discussing one of the very important clauses in this Andhra State Bill. At certain moments in our discussion feelings of bitterness were roused, harsh words were exchanged and claims and counter claims were made. It looked as though in this House itself our friends Mr. K. Vinayakam and Mr. Varadachari had some challenges

[Sri T. Nagi Reddi] [18th July 1953]

and counter-challenges. On the whole, I should say that the discussion on this very crucial point has gone in a very friendly spirit. I hope that in future also we would carry this spirit in the face of small differences that would probably arise and try to settle our problems in a brotherly way. The boundary problem is not a very difficult question at all if we keep in mind the principle on which we base our claim to linguistic provinces. The claim to a linguistic Province based on certain fundamental principle of language is by itself a decisive point in the demarcation of the boundaries. First of all we had taken some steps for the formation of a separate State and then almost every party demanded that a Boundary Commission should be set up to demarcate the boundaries between the States that are to be formed. If we go through the amendments that have been given notice of, it is really very surprising to find that a number of the amendments go to the very root of the problem. We make it appear that we are sitting here as though we are a Boundary Commission by ourselves who are going to decide the whole problem in this House itself. For the past thirty years there have been particular decisions by particular majority parties in the States and some of these amendments run counter to those decisions themselves. All those areas which are claimed by particular linguistic groups are sought to be removed from one State or the other for the simple reason that there is some amount of 'indistinctness' in that portion of the territory. If we look at the question from that point of view we must remember that every State that has to be formed or that has already been formed will have a bi-lingual area even after the Boundary Commission decides the question in the best possible manner. Now, these bi-lingual areas will exist even if Mr. Varadachari and Mr. Vinayakam go in for a battle-royal to decide the boundaries in the best possible way. The question is in what friendly and scientific manner the matter can be decided to the best advantage of all the States. Whenever the Government commit a mistake, it is but natural that the mistake will be countered by another mistake. The Government have committed a mistake in respect of Bellary. I only wish that the Government do not commit any such mistakes in the future. (Interruption by the Hon. the Chief Minister). The Government do not help those who want to help them. They get into the mud and want to come out clean. But when they find that they cannot get out of it, they get into some other pit. The Central Government have created problems where they did not at all exist and now they are trying to face those problems in an entirely different way. I am only sorry that they are going to create many more problems which cannot be solved and which will create only bitter feelings and bad blood. If the question is approached with certain fundamental principles, I am sure the Government can decide this problem very easily in the best interest of the people of all the States and keep the position of the minorities also safe.

" At the time the Communist Party asked for the formation of linguistic provinces, it said that the Andhra State should be

18th July 1953]

[Sri T. Nagi Reddi]

formed immediately with eleven districts and three taluks of Bellary district in the first instance and that a boundary commission should be appointed to go into, and decide, the question of boundaries. When the Communist Party referred to eleven districts and three taluks, it did not, and even to-day does not, mean that there are no Tamil areas in Andhra State or Telugu areas in the residuary State or Mysore State or Kanarese areas in the Andhra or the residuary State. It was made clear and very properly too that the eleven districts and three taluks were suggested only as a temporary thing for the immediate formation of the Andhra State and that afterwards a boundary commission should be appointed to settle the boundaries.

“Immediately after the announcement about the formation of the new State, passions were sought to be roused on the border by quite a number of people. We have seen such attempts even in this House. I am really sorry for the statement of Mr. K. Vinayakam that the claims of the Andhras over certain portions in Salem, North Arcot and Chingleput, etc., are a farce. Referring to Chittoor district, he even said that Andhras came and contaminated the area as though it was cholera or plague. Mr. Vinayakam is a well-educated gentleman. Just as he has said that Mr. K. Varadachari is a civilized Andhra, he is a civilized Tamilian. There is no doubt that he is a well-educated and civilized gentleman. It was made clear in his speech that historically certain things were existing in Chittoor and that, on account of Andhras coming and contaminating, the atmosphere became dirty. I am only sorry that such propaganda has contaminated and poisoned the atmosphere of our State, the result of which we are now witnessing. Hereafter at least Mr. Vinayakam and his friends need not descend to such a low level of talk but keep within limits, so that we may be enabled to argue points in a spirit of friendship and brotherhood and come to an agreement or settlement. The boundary commission will have to come and we will have to place our points before it. The manner and the method in which we place our points before the commission is very important. The methods that are being adopted now are not proper or congenial for the establishment of friendly relations between the two States. I went to Tiruttani, when there was tempo there, to see the atmosphere for myself. I told the Tamilians and Andhras there: ‘Why do you get agitated over the problem? A boundary commission will come and decide the boundaries. The Communist Party, as one of the major parties, will stand behind the Tamilians and Andhras in respect of their claim for predominantly Tamil and Telugu areas respectively. It will certainly not ask for inclusion in the Andhra State of any area in which the predominant language is other than Telugu. It stands for friendly relations among the people.’ I could have made an exciting speech and become a great leader for the moment. But I also know that these things will recoil on me at a later period. Let us be straightforward and think in friendly terms. When one goes and speaks to the ordinary man in words which should not be spoken to him, especially in the manner in

[Sri T. Nagi Reddi] [18th July 1953]

which an educated gentleman like Mr. Vinayakam did, I am not surprised at what has happened. I do not want to go into that controversy. I am only telling Mr. Vinayakam that the responsibility for what has happened does not belong to people of Mr. Nagi Reddi's type.

"It was said that historical precedents were there for including certain territories within this State or that State. If we go into history, we have to go very deep into it. I know that Dr. Nagan Gouda and Mr. Nagi Reddi will not be able to come to an agreement by delving into history. We cannot say whether Krishnadeva Raya or Bukkha Raya was a Telugu ruler or a Kanarese ruler. Such rulers have done immense good to Rayalaseema. I claim them to be Telugu, and Dr. Nagan Gouda claims them to be Kanarese. I have received a memorandum from certain Kannadigas to the effect that the taluks of Hindupur, Uravakonda, Kalyandrug, Gooty, Madagasira, Dharmavaram, Anantapur and Penukonda belong to them, because historically they were ruled by Kanarese kings. There are some Andhras who claim the whole of the Bellary district which claim we have repudiated from the very beginning. Our claim has always been that there are portions which are both Telugu and Kanarese and that they should be divided very carefully. On historical grounds Mr. Vinayakam is pleading that six taluks of Chittoor district should be added to the residuary State. It has been the claim of Andhras that Madras City is Telugu historically-speaking and that it has been contaminated by people like Mr. Vinayakam. I do not want to enter into past history. I want division in the interests of the people as they exist now. That is how I want this problem to be decided. If we can solve this problem by mutual agreement, we will be setting up a good tradition for the formation of other linguistic provinces in future.

"I come to the amendments immediately. We have given notice of a number of amendments, and among them there are three major amendments which are very important. The Government came forward with their own amendment. It is not acceptable because it is very vague. It is reported in this morning's newspapers that Mr. Hanumanthaiya, Chief Minister of Mysore, has said that he is not willing to re-open the question of Bellary taluk. Let us face facts as they are. Justice Misra was sent to Bellary not for deciding the question of boundary, but for deciding whether Bellary taluk as a whole should be included in the Andhra State or the Mysore State for the present at the time of the constitution of the Andhra State. So the question of boundary has not been decided. Even Justice Misra himself has said that the boundary question cannot be decided easily without a plebiscite. He has said that in Moka, Rupanagudi and Bellary firkas and Bellary town, neither the Andhras nor the **Kannadigas** form a majority, and that their future cannot be decided by simply going about, talking to the people and receiving memoranda.

"He said that this question could be decided only by taking into consideration the opinion of the people, which can be ascertained by holding a plebiscite. That is the verdict given, and that is

18th July 1953]

[Sri T. Nagi Reddi]

exactly what the Andhras of the area are asking for. The Andhras say that a plebiscite be held there, and then that area be declared to be included either in the Andhra State or in the Madras State, according to the wishes of the people. The wish of the people is very important. The question is, who forms the majority there. This question has not been decided. This must be decided by a plebiscite. I hope the Government of India will take this matter into consideration and also take into consideration the factor that Justice Misra's report is not a Boundary Commission, and therefore it is not a final report, and that it does not say categorically that 'this is the Kanarese area'. Misra's report has come forward with the acknowledged fact that that area is a bi-lingual area where there is neither Kanarese majority nor Telugu majority. As per Misra's report—the Kannadiga population in Moka, Rupanagudi and Bellary town does not exceed 40,000 whereas non-Kannadiga population is nearly 90,000. Hence, public opinion, i.e., plebiscite will have to be taken into consideration.

"Yesterday, the Hon. the Chief Minister did not come forward with a categorical answer to the question, 'what is a disputed area'. All those disputed areas will have to be taken into consideration by the Boundary Commission. Does disputed area mean only those places where there have been disturbances and claims and counter-claims? Does it not include the area that is now to be demarcated areas between Mysore and Andhra States and areas between Residuary State and Andhra State? What do we mean by the term 'disputed area'. When the Government of India has taken a decision to allocate that part of the Madras State to-day, which forms predominantly a Kanarese part, that is the Bellary taluk, to the Mysore State, and to appoint a Boundary Commission to decide the question of certain of the other Kanarese areas that are there in the Andhra State for the time being, say, Madakasira taluk, Adoni taluk, etc., then it becomes very important and necessary that those areas of the Mysore State which are predominantly Telugu areas, should also be taken into consideration when the Boundary Commission is appointed. That is the specific question of the Andhras to-day, and I say that there need be no trouble in deciding this question. Why should we to-day object to this particular method of deciding the disputed areas? When a particular portion or portions of the Kanarese area are being added on to the Mysore State, which is predominantly a Kannada State, why should not those areas wherein Telugu is predominant, but which are for the time being parts of the Mysore State, be not added on to Andhra State, and a boundary line be not drawn so that this question of disputed areas is solved once and for all? This is a very clear question that is being asked, just as Kannada friends naturally say that a certain portion should go to the Mysore State, just because Mysore State is essentially a Kannada State. So also, the Andhras of the Andhra State and the Andhras of the Mysore State would like to get the Andhra areas in the Mysore State, to their Andhra State, so that the boundary question can be settled once and for all. This is a very sensible demand. This is a small demand. I hope the Hon. the Chief Minister, when he explains

[Sri T. Nagi Reddi] [18th July 1953]

the position regarding the Government amendment, would certainly help us by telling that the phrase 'in respect of the boundary of the Andhra State in those areas' means also that the boundaries that are there in the Mysore State, and the boundaries that are there in the Residuary State will also be taken into consideration when a Boundary Commission is appointed.

"Sir, the question of minorities is coming up quite often. Mr. Vinayakam said that no Andhra will ever go to the Andhra State from the Residuary State. Why should Mr. Vinayakam say so? I will not say that no Tamilian will go to a Tamilian State. My wish is quite known. Every Tamil majority area will have to go and will go to the Tamil State. It is because I want that a united and culturally and economically strong State should develop on the other side. Then only there will be the tendency to migrate.

"On the question of minorities both Mr. Vinayakam and Andhras on the other side will have to protect the rights of minorities. There is no doubt about it. The rights of Andhras in Madras, Chingleput, Salem, etc., will have to be protected in the same way as the rights of Tamilians in the Andhra State. We shall not come forward and say that no Andhra will ever go to the Andhra State because the capital is so far away. Such arguments can be put forward by Members from Malabar saying that that portion of Tamil Nad adjoining Malabar should be given to them because Madras is far away from them. This is all school boys' arguments. They rouse the feelings of one people against another. These arguments will not help to educate the people in the proper manner. (Mr. Speaker occupied the Chair at this stage). I do hope that Mr. Vinayakam will accept, as it was accepted once, according to press reports, by Mr. Kamaraj Nadar, T. T. Krishnamachari and our Chief Minister, Sri C. Rajagopalachari, that portions of Hosur taluk, Chingleput and North Arcot districts, which belong to the Andhra State being contiguous to the Andhra State, will all be taken into consideration. That is the commonsense point of view. Instead of taking things in that light and in that way, we go on talking in the other way saying that there will not be a single Tamilian who would go to the Tamil State and Mr. Vinayakam goes on saying that no Andhra will ever go to the Andhra State from the Residuary State. This is a form of argument followed by politicians who want to raise their leadership high in the eyes of the people, and who want public opinion to be in their favour. This will not help us.

"Sir, in the end I would say that the Boundary Commission will have to go into the question of Chittoor district, Salem district, Chingleput district, North Arcot district and Bellary district. In Bellary taluk there is the question of plebiscite. The taluks of Alur, Adoni and other places, and the areas in the Mysore State will have to be settled by the Boundary Commission.

18th July 1953]

[Sri T. Nagi Reddi]

“ There is one amendment about which I should like to say a few words. The amendment has been given notice of by Sri T. N. Venkatasubba Reddi and Sri N. Ramakrishna Ayyar. The amendment reads :—

‘ Provided that the Government of India do take necessary steps to finally settle the boundaries of the Madras, Andhra and Mysore, Orissa, Hyderabad and Madhya Pradesh States, either by mutual agreement between the States concerned or by a Boundary Commission or Commissions and that the districts concerned may thereupon be reformed accordingly.’

This amendment will do some justice to remove the injustice done previously. I shall refer to one more point. The Boundary Commission Report on the Orissa State can be read by any hon. Member here. He will then understand the manner in which the Andhra portions have been added to Orissa even after having been shown that those portions were Andhra portions. This is explained in the report. The Andhra majority is in those portions. But simply because the Maharaja of Parlakimedi said that those areas should be added on to Orissa, they were added to Orissa. Because the Raja of Parlakimedi wanted those portions to be added on to Andhra, the then British Government and the landlords thought that the opinion of the zamindars, which was against that of the thousands of people who existed there, should be accepted. That was the injustice done.

“ Here is a demand that has been made for a long time past. Here is a chance to fulfil it. I do hope that the Government will take the question into consideration and do justice so that we may not have mutual bickerings in the future. For this reason, I commend these amendments for the acceptance of the House and I hope that we will solve this problem of boundaries in a friendly spirit. I hope also that we will not rouse the passions of the people against each other and try to embitter the feelings between brother Tamilians and Andhras and brother Kannadigas and Telugus. I hope that by solving this problem amicably and in a friendly way, we shall have two neighbourly, brotherly States and strong States, to co-operate with each other in future in building a mutually good Government and in increasing our other relations, economic and cultural, in the best possible way. Thank you, Sir.” 12
noon.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I must tell the House that we shall sit now till we finish consideration of this clause or till one o'clock, whichever is earlier. Afterwards, we shall sit from 3 p.m. to 5 p.m. From Monday onwards the House will sit from 8-30 a.m. to 1-30 p.m. at a stretch.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, the object of the Bill which is now under discussion is the formation of the Andhra State. As we all know, it is the outcome of an agitation carried on for a very long period of about forty years. Therefore, we have to see whether the object is fulfilled. What is the object? The object is to combine all the Telugu-speaking areas which are contiguously lying and form them into one State. That is why some of our Friends have moved certain amendments dealing with, or including, or mentioning, the names of Hyderabad, Orissa and Mysore. We should, therefore, rectify the borders between Orissa

[Sri T. Viswanatham] [18th July 1953]

and the Andhra State, and the borders between Mysore and the Andhra State. A real difficulty arises only with respect to Mysore and Orissa as they form different linguistic units. The object of the Bill being the formation of the Andhra State, I submit that the revision of the boundaries and frontiers both on the Orissa side and Mysore side also forms an essential factor. It has been understood from the speech made by the Hon. the Chief Minister that the question relating to the borders on the Mysore side and the Orissa side will not form part of any future discussions or the work of Boundary Commissions, but that we shall confine our attention—and the Bill itself confines its attention—to the formation of a State cordoned off into what are called the undisputed areas in the present State of Madras. As I said, there is a difference in the approach. We have been asking for an Andhra State consisting of the Telugu areas within these borders and for rectifying and adjusting the borders. Therefore, I would ask the Hon. the Chief Minister to consider that aspect also. Otherwise, we would not be doing justice to the object with which this Bill has been introduced as a result of a long course of struggle. That is the reason why I ask all hon. Members to give sympathetic consideration to the amendments dealing with that aspect of the question. For example, I would refer to amendment No. 21 which deals in a comprehensive way with the object with which this Andhra agitation was started and which gives an idea of what areas the Andhras want to be included in the territories of the Andhra State.

“ Now, Sir, having said so much as to the general scope of the territories which the Andhra State should have, I come to clauses 3 and 4 which are now under discussion. Clause 3 gives the names of certain districts and taluks which will form the Andhra State, and clause 4 treats of the transfer of territory from Madras to Mysore. Sir, this Mysore is a third party to the whole affair. There is a well-known jurisdic principle that third parties to contracts, strangers to contracts, cannot take advantage. Now, when did this Mysore come into the picture? It was not in the picture at all when Mr. Justice Wanchoo presented his report. Afterwards, between the 7th February, the date on which Mr. Justice Wanchoo presented his Report and the 25th March 1953, the date on which the Prime Minister of India made his statement, Mysore came or butted in. I do not know by what door Mysore came into the picture. But still, we do not know what unseen forces worked, and on the 25th March 1953 the Prime Minister of India made a statement that certain areas in Bellary district would be transferred to Mysore. That was the beginning of the agitation which is deplored both by the Kannada Members and the Telugu Members on the floor of this House. The mistake arose because the Government of India did not follow what Mr. Justice Wanchoo had recommended in his Report. After all, Mr. Justice Wanchoo was as much an officer as Mr. Justice Misra who subsequently came to figure in this scene. Yet, the Government of India, for some overriding political considerations, have not accepted Mr. Justice Wanchoo's recommendation and they have plunged headlong into the recommendation made by Mr. Justice Misra. That

18th July 1953]

[Sri T. Viswanatham]

is the cause of the trouble. The trouble is with regard to Bellary district. Of course, the Telugus have not contended that Bellary is all Telugu. We never went into the historical side also. We could have claimed it, no doubt. In fact, all the Members from Bellary, as you, Sir, may remember—because you were Speaker for the last five years—were speaking, whenever any advantage was wanted, on behalf of Rayalaseema.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The Rayalaseema claim is on the ground of famine and is not a linguistic claim.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Rayalaseema claim is a territorial claim, in fact, affecting the dignity . . . ”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ There is no connexion between dignity and the various famine concessions given to Rayalaseema. It is poverty, monsoon and conditions of climate that apply luckily irrespective of languages.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ We all pay our homage to Krishna Deva Raya. That is why we call it ‘ Rayalaseema ’ in order to attach a particular dignity. (Interruption.) The Hon. Sri Nagan Gouda claims him, Sri Viswanatham claims him. I was on another point altogether. When it was a question of fighting for the advantages of Rayalaseema, friends from that district were always claiming themselves to be Rayalaseema people. Really speaking, if it is left to me, I have no quarrel. I would even go so far as to say that there should be no difference between the Kannadigas and the Telugu people. Our script is the same; our traditions are the same; Krishna Deva Raya is common to us both. There is so much in common between us and I only wonder why we are quarrelling about it. But, all the same, when passions are roused and when things are taking a particular shape, it is only proper for Members representing public interests to put forward their views. Now, I began by saying that Mr. Justice Wanchoo’s recommendation was not accepted and Bellary taluk was made a special exception of the investigation and Mr. Justice Misra was sent for investigation.

“ He was sent to enquire into the various factors and to make a fuller investigation as rapidly as possible, and submit a report to the Government of India recommending any minor adjustments that he might consider necessary. It has been conceded and it is written in the report also that Justice Misra went to the area. He went to Bellary. He did not go to Madras. He did not go to the disputed areas and villages even though people from these places wanted him to visit their place. He records in his report that although it was his original intention to go to the disputed areas, he could not do so. His visit to these disputed areas formed part of the fuller investigation which he was called upon to make. Anyway, he dropped his visit to these disputed areas, but went to Bangalore. How did Bangalore come into the picture, I ask, Mr. Speaker? Is it at present a disputed area? He might have gone to Madras, which he has not done. He should have gone to the

12-13
p.m.

[Sri T. Viswanatham] [18th July 1953]

disputed areas, which also he has not done. He went to Bangalore instead and stayed there as the guest of the State Government and things got changed later on. It is a fact which cannot be overlooked. I am not insinuating anybody. These are facts collected from the official records themselves."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Sir, I consider it my duty to draw the attention of the Hon. Speaker to what was last observed by hon. Member Sri Viswanatham. I think he let himself into a wrong statement which he ought not to have made. I am glad he himself, without anybody pointing out to him, sees the insinuation contained in his statement."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, I know it is a very delicate matter. Supposing a Commissioner is appointed by a Court in connexion with a property dispute and he goes not to the field of dispute but to the plaintiff's house, comes back and writes the report, and if this fact is pointed out, can it be called insinuation? We are only presenting facts. Therefore it is said by most of the Members that it cannot be called an Award. The Hon. Chief Minister himself said that the word 'Award' was used somewhat loosely and that it was only an enquiry report. The Telugu people of the area are only asking for what Mr. Justice Misra himself suggests; namely a plebiscite. Why should anybody fight shy of a plebiscite? If the result of the plebiscite is in favour of the Kannadigas, let them take Bellary even to-morrow or day after to-morrow. If it is in favour of the Andhras, let them take it. I think the Telugu people are demanding a plebiscite possibly because they are sure of their case and my Kannadiga friends are not so sure. As there was no proper enquiry into the matter, the Andhras ask for a plebiscite. Even Justice Misra has declared that nothing short of a plebiscite could settle the question and it is not for Hon. Mr. Hanumanthayya, the Chief Minister of Mysore, to say, 'We shall not allow the Bellary question to be re-opened'. It is not anybody's private affair. Mysore, a third party, came into the picture. That is our objection and that is the cause of the entire trouble. Even now, there is not much to be worried about. We only want a plebiscite with regard to the territories and I very respectfully submit that it is a very reasonable request.

" I will not go into the other matters. I can put forward various arguments to show that certain areas of Bellary which we have mentioned in some of our amendments should really go to the Andhra State. But when I am asking for a plebiscite, I do not like to go into details. I am prepared for it and let the other side also be prepared. If they win in the plebiscite, we shall gladly and willingly and with rose garlands make a present of the area to our Kannadiga friends, who after all are our brothers.

" As regards the Government amendment, yesterday I was making certain suggestions for consideration whether it could be improved so as to include the views of those who were not on the Government side. I happened to give a revised draft to the Hon.

18th July 1953] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

Chief Minister. I would like to just read it to show how it could be improved. My revised amendment will read as follows :—

‘ A clause should be included in this Part of the Bill to the effect that, as soon as possible after the formation of the Andhra State, the President shall appoint one or more Boundary Commissions for inquiring into the claims and disputes in respect of border areas and for making recommendations as to any adjustments that may be necessary in respect of the boundaries of the States of Andhra, Madras and Mysore.’

Sir, I have included certain phrases in the clause only to clarify what is passing in the mind of the Hon. Chief Minister. What is the Boundary Commission intended for? It has to decide claims and disputes and there is nothing more. What is it that I want? There will be claims and counter-claims. Everybody says that a Boundary Commission must be appointed. If and when it is appointed it has got to enquire into the claims and disputes. Therefore I have included the phrase ‘ claims and disputes in respect of border areas ’. The original amendment says ‘ disputes that have arisen ’. There may be some confusion if we leave it like that. It may refer to some specific items, and it is likely that an order may be passed stating, ‘ The following is the list of disputes that will be referred to the Commission ’. Therefore I have revised the amendment in a general way. Again, it is said in the original amendment, ‘ disputes that have arisen ’. Some disputes might have arisen and might subside after some time, and there will be no necessity to refer such matters to the Boundary Commission. That is why I have revised this part of the amendment. Again, the original amendment refers to only the Andhra State. I have included Madras and Mysore States. The Andhra State has as its border the Mysore and Madras States. There is no doubt about it, and there should be no trouble about it. When we say ‘ Boundary ’, it should certainly include the boundaries of Mysore and Madras States also. That is why I have included Madras and Mysore in the amendment. In doing this, I have got the very high authority of the Prime Minister of India. In fact I took these words and expressions from his statement. This is what he said in a statement issued by him on the 25th March—

“ . . . to recommend such adjustments as may be considered necessary in regard to the boundaries of that State with the residuary State of Madras and the Mysore State.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ I think Mr. Viswanatham will be able to tell me the date of the statement. Is it issued before or after the appointment of Justice Misra? ”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ The Prime Minister made that statement on the 25th March. The appointment of Justice Misra does not wipe out the statement of the Prime Minister of India. As a matter of fact, it is in pursuance of that statement all other things happened. Necessarily, that statement was issued before the appointment of Misra. It does not matter very much whether it is before or after Justice Misra’s appointment. Justice Misra did not go to the disputed areas. He only went to Bangalore as the guest of the Mysore State.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Bangalore was 12-2 near and he went there for rest. That is a different matter.”

[18th July 1953]

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ He himself does not say so. He said that he went there to hear Mysoris' claims but our Chief Minister says he went there for rest. He went there to receive representations from the Chief Minister of Mysore giving their views but there was no Andhra State to represent the Andhra view. We are helpless. That is our complaint. Instead of multiplying arguments, all that I say is we should make provision for a plebiscite. Why should any reasonable person refuse a plebiscite in disputed areas unless he is so sure that the case is bad? There are certain recognized ways of solving questions like this. Where a dispute like this has arisen, there should be a plebiscite. Once this principle is accepted, it will be easier to settle the issue. Instead of this why take figures of census and say the census figures are wrong, the Telugu-speaking people there were not born there and even if they were born, they were not nourished there and so on? ”

SRI KOTRA BASAVANA GOUD :—“ Does the hon. Member want a plebiscite for Bellary alone or for other areas also? Why then a boundary commission? ”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ My friend from Bellary does not understand the difference between a plebiscite and a boundary commission. I am sorry to say that. The functions of a boundary commission are very wide, much wider than the scope of a plebiscite. But there are certain areas which are now sought to be excluded by hon. Friends here and by the Chief Minister of Mysore from the purview of the boundary commission. That is why I say at least take a plebiscite or include them in the scope of the boundary commission.”

SRI R. SIDDANNA GOWD :—“ The atmosphere is not favourable for plebiscite.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ My friend here is repeating what Justice Misra, who did not go to the disputed areas, although he was appointed to go there, said. He said that the atmosphere was not favourable and from the facts supplied to him he would recommend Bellary to be given to the Mysore State. If he said that the atmosphere was not favourable, why not you wait for a favourable atmosphere? Why do you give up the idea of a plebiscite, if you agree it is reasonable and stands to reason? It is logic. It is common sense. I only submit to the Chief Minister to have plebiscite in respect of the three firkas mentioned in our amendments. Of course, the amendments in respect of a boundary commission in general stand on a different footing altogether because they will deal with all those boundaries which are contiguous to the Andhra State. And I must thank the Chief Minister for bringing in his amendment because when you say Andhra State boundaries, it really means boundaries of Madras and Mysore. No one could take objection to that. There is no particular snag in it and there is no cobra in the basket.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ You see cobras in our amendments? ”

18th July 1953]

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" No. But the same thing said by one man means one thing but means another if said by another. The word is the same, the dictionary is the same and the letters are the same. But the content and meaning differ with the men who use them. (Laughter.) I have added only one word 'claims'. I have not put in 'claims' displacing 'disputes.' My amendment includes disputes, claims and counter-claims. We require a certain amount of clarification because feelings and suspicions have been roused."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" I hope my friend will not object to a little clarification I would like to make by intervening now. Claim includes dispute only if the claim is not accepted. When the claim is made and the claim is not accepted, then it becomes dispute. So what we really want is some proper word and 'dispute' is the proper word according to me and not a unilateral claim made from time to time as occasions arise."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I am not referring to unilateral claims or claims and counter-claims or any particular disputes. I am putting in some provision whereby when a claim is made, counter-claim is made and, therefore, a dispute arises, the boundary commission, when it is appointed, may be able to give a decision on it. And I may assure you cent per cent that we will accept that decision whether it goes in our favour or against us."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Therefore, 'dispute' is quite enough and is right also."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" The word 'dispute' is not enough, Sir. Some people are content with a shirt on. Others want a coat over it. This trouble has arisen because the Chief Minister of Mysore has made a statement which is reported in this morning's papers."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Surely, Sir, we have been talking too much about the statements made in the Mysore Assembly. The Mysore Chief Minister has a right of his own to make his own statements. We are concerned with claims and disputes here. But we are dealing with the Chief Minister of Mysore in his absence. How can we do that? "

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" That is our trouble. The Chief Minister of Mysore came in our absence and put us into this trouble."

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—" On a point of order, Sir, can any other State Chief Minister make statements concerning this State? "

MR. SPEAKER :—" That is also no point of order."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" The question itself has arisen on a point of order." (Laughter.)

SRI K. SUBBA REDDI :—" On a point of order, Sir, no provision is made in the amendment that is suggested as to how

[Sri K. Subba Reddi]

[18h July 1953]

Bellary district is to be administered—these six taluks—before a boundary commission is appointed and before a plebiscite is taken. My suggestion is that provision should be made that under no circumstances should these six taluks go to Mysore.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ This is also no point of order.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ That is another aspect that my friend is suggesting. This trouble has arisen because we have taken two clauses together. One is for the present case and the other is for a future contingency. There is therefore some confusion about it. The Hon. the Chief Minister is good enough to say that we need not take what the Chief Minister of Mysore has said. I wish it were so. If the Chief Minister wants that we need not take into account the views of the Mysore Chief Minister, I want the Chief Minister of Madras to put our case and not the case of Mysore before the Centre. I am referring to the Chief Minister of Mysore because he has become unnecessarily a party to the transaction. Sitting elsewhere he can talk anything. (The Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachari: ‘He has heard you.’) He heard me. In the first instance, he was good enough to say that Hyderabad and Madras spent money and Mysore was getting Tungabhadra as a gift only. When I said ‘you have to bear liability’, he woke up to it. Even so now I understand that the Mysore Government are willing to bear 30 per cent, when they take 45 per cent benefit from the Tungabhadra Project.

12-30
p.m.

“ Who is to represent our case now? The Andhra State has not yet been formed. That is why hon. Member Sri Prakasam said that a third party with whom we cannot speak face to face should not come into this picture. They have now been allowed to come in and all these troubles have arisen. It would have been better if the Mysore Government had been removed from the picture and the Andhra State, the Mysore State and Prime Minister were allowed independently to deal with the matter later. That would have rendered so much passion unnecessary. Therefore may I appeal to the Hon. the Chief Minister to see whether it would be possible to accept our revised amendment. It is not too late now. After all we are only expressing our views. The Parliament has got to discuss the Bill and pass it. There is plenty of time. I am sure the Hon. the Chief Minister is capable of rising to such occasions. Otherwise they would say: ‘This is the opinion of the Hon. Chief Minister of Madras. He has said that Bellary ought to go to Mysore.’ If the Hon. Chief Minister says it, he should not say it and the Central Government also should not expect him to give any such partisan opinion and that is my request. At least so far as the trouble between Hon. Sri Nagan Gowda and myself is concerned let the Hon. the Chief Minister remain neutral.

“ Sir much has been said on this issue. I only want the Hon. the Chief Minister and the Government of India to keep in mind the entire view with which this Bill was introduced. It is the result of the agitation carried on for forty years. The purpose of

18th July 1953]

[Sri T. Viswanatham]

this Bill is to establish a separate Andra State including within it as large a territory as possible which is contiguously outlying on its borders. The Government of India also must consider and give us all the outlying areas which are contiguous, which are Telugu-speaking areas—it may be in the north, it may be in the west or it may be in the south-west. That is why we have moved amendment No. 21 which is very comprehensive. Amendment No. 44 moved by hon. Member Sri Gopala Menon also gives expression more or less to the views we have expressed. It is therefore necessary that these things should be done. I request the Hon. the Chief Minister to separate the question of plebiscite with regard to these small areas from that of the boundary commission. We have been insisting for some time that a separate State of Andhra should be formed. It has been conceded. It is now only a question of taking over. But here before the State is formed a part of the disputed area has been given away to another State. My submission is that the *status quo* must be preserved. What is the use of giving away territories and then going to the boundary commission? What after all is the territory concerned? Merely three firkas. The Andhras say they have got claim. The Kannadigas say, in a really *bona fide* way they have a claim over these firkas. Therefore plebiscite is the only answer to this problem. I therefore want this matter and other matters should be separated. With these remarks I want to enquire of the Hon. the Chief Minister whether he is agreeable to the few changes I have made to the amendment moved by the Government”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ When the Hon. Chief Minister speaks he will give a reply.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ On his statement will depend the course of conduct we will adopt in regard to this matter.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ As I said, the whole of yesterday and this morning was taken for drafting this thing and some time was given to me this morning when it was handed over here. I am going to speak when the time comes and I shall explain my whole position as I feel.”

* THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish to thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak on this subject to-day. I would have been glad to have spoken during the general discussion because then I wanted to express my pleasure also on the achievement by the Andhra people of their cherished objective, namely, the Andhra State. Andhras are very proud of their language, they love their language. They say : ‘ దేశభాషలను తెలుగు లెస్స’ .”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ May I correct him, Sir. It is not a question of our saying it, Sir. It is what Krishnadevaraya says in a verse in a ‘ Prabhanda ’.”

[18th July 1953]

* THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—" I do not see any connexion, Sir. They said that. When I say they said that, the hon. Member says that Krishnadevaraya said it. Evidently, then he was not a Telugu man." (Laughter.)

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" There is no controversy over it. Krishnadevaraya was a Tulu."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" He was a Tamilian, Sir." (Laughter.)

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" He was a Tulu. His ancestors established an empire and his capital was at Vizianagaram. He was the foremost of the kings. He wrote literature in Telugu. He expanded the Andhra Empire. That is all, Sir."

* THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—" I am very happy this incident has brought forth the part of the country to which he belonged. I think we are all making a mistake in thinking that the Vizianagaram Empire started with Krishnadevaraya. He came to the throne in 1509. But in 1336 the sons of Sangama, Harihara and Bukka and three others established the empire. It is only after they had ruled the country for 150 years and after they had established the famous Kingdom at Humpi—I am happy to belong to that place and come from that place—that Krishnadevaraya came. For these 150 years they kept off the invasion of South India from the North. After that, the original Sangama dynasty was overthrown, not in a very respectable way, by the chief of the armies. One of the ancestors of Krishnadevaraya was that Chief.

" Apart from that decision, I am glad that the Andhras who love their language very much—they have rightly said that Telugu is the Italian of the East—have achieved their objective, namely, the formation of the Andhra State.

12-40 P.M. " But, the same privilege must be given to the other people who love their own language. Sir, the claim has been made on Bellary for conveniences and considerations and other things like that. If you are going to have a linguistic province, then you cannot have any areas where Telugu is not spoken. Other considerations like economics, transport, projects and things like that cannot have consideration. You cannot have a linguistic State and also the conveniences. The Hon. the Chief Minister of this State has said again and again that the country cannot be divided on linguistic basis. There are other considerations which ought to be attended to. (Interruptions from Opposition Benches.) Now the Andhras want to have a linguistic State and also have all the conveniences. ಆವ್ಯ ಕಾವಲ್, ಬಯ್ಯ ಕಾವಲ್! is not possible. You want to eat the cake and have it too. If you want to have the linguistic State, you have to put up with some inconveniences.

" Sir, yesterday I believe, while Sri Prakasam was speaking, the question came about the records that are kept in Bellary in Telugu. It is something about which we complained to the

18th July 1953]

[Dr. R Nagan Gouda]

Central Government, the British Government, ever since the Congress came to agitate for self-Government, or for Swaraj or Independence. In an area like Bellary where the predominant language is Kannada, merely for the sake of convenience—when all the four districts were ceded by the Nizam, along with the three districts where Telugu was spoken,—Telugu officers and language were imposed on the Kannada areas of Bellary. For a hundred years, people whose mother-tongue is Kannada—I am anxious to tell this so that Mr. Prakasam and others must note—have been compelled to read and write the Telugu language which is not their mother-tongue.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ On a point of order, Sir.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ There is no point of order. The Hon. Nagan Gouda will continue.”

* THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ And now Sir, I know Mr. Prakasam will agree with me that it is an injustice. That has been done from 1805 when the districts were ceded by the Nizam to the British. We have been compelled to read Telugu while our mother-tongue has been Kannada. It was only in 1916 that we made representations and then got Kannada introduced as another language along with Telugu in our district.

“ Now, Sir, Bellary taluk has become the bone of contention. I am not going to take much of your time. But I will content myself with saying this: that in 1920 or 1921 when Kelkar gave his award he definitely gave Bellary taluk to Karnatak Pradesh Congress Committee. That was in 1921. After that, in 1950, the Partition Committee of the Madras Government which consisted of Sri Prakasam, Sri Gopala Reddi, Sri Kala Venkata Rao, Sri Sanjiva Reddi and Sri Madhava Menon, Sri Kumarasami Raja and Sri Bhakthavathsalam went into the question. There was not one Kannada representative there. At that time, that Partition Committee gave Bellary taluk to the Residuary State. Mr. Prakasam who gave at that time a minute of dissent did not say a word about Bellary taluk then.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Will you please read out his minute? ”

* THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ Sir, then Mr. Wanchoo came and made his enquiry. What did he say? He gave also Bellary taluk to the Karnataka area. He said an alternative solution would be to separate the three taluks of Alur, Adoni and Rayadurg here and now and allow ‘ the remaining seven taluks ’, please note, they include Bellary taluk—‘ to form the Bellary district which will be predominantly Kanarese ’. I want members to note that.

“ Then, Sir, after the Kelkar Award, after the Partition Committee and after Justice Wanchoo had given Bellary to Karnataka, Mr. Justice Misra was sent to make an enquiry. It was not at the request of the Kannada people that Mr. Justice Misra was sent.

[Dr. R. Nagan Gouda] [18th July 1953]

Indeed, the Pradesh Congress Committee which met at Hubli just before Mr. Justice Misra was appointed, said that if there was going to be an enquiry, it should be in all the four taluks, (i.e.), the three taluks of Alur, Adoni and Rayadurg and Bellary also. Never did they (the Andhras) protest against the appointment of Mr. Justice Misra. And then Sir, when Mr. Justice Misra came, Mr. Prakasam and Messrs. Kala Venkata Rao, the Secretary of the Andhra Pradesh Congress Committee, and the President of the Andhra Congress Committee gave memoranda to him and at that time too nothing was said about this. Now, Sir, is it because that Misra's findings went against their desires they complained? They had not made a claim for Bellary before and they made a claim for Bellary only after the statement of March 25th, by the Prime Minister? God alone knows why it was that statement contained a special announcement about Bellary. Somebody perhaps who had taken a special and recent interest in Andhra had also interested himself in Bellary taluk.

“ Sir, we have heard so many members get up and talk against the decision of Mr. Justice Misra; but the figures that have been given by Misra have not been refuted by anybody at all. The report of Mr. Justice Misra is before us, but nobody has been able to criticise it. That is a significant thing. I will tell the House why it is so. Sir, in Bellary taluk, there are 89,000 Kannadigas, which is 52 per cent, and there are 43,000 Telugus—I am giving round figures—which is 25 per cent. This is, taking Bellary taluk without the floating population which includes the population in the jails and those people who are operating and working on the Tungabhadra project. Sir, with that huge difference between 52 and 25 per cent, how can they claim Bellary taluk? Sir, when that demand became something that they could not maintain, then the demand is made for the firkas.

12-59 p.m. “ Now, let us take the firkas of Rupanagudi, Moka and Bellary. Rupanagudi firka has a population of about 16,000, out of which 8,800 are Kanarese (52 per cent) and about 40 per cent are Telugu people. Moka firka has about 57 per cent Kanarese and 35 per cent Telugu people. Bellary firka including Bellary city has 32 per cent Kanarese and 27 per cent Telugu people, the balance 41 per cent comprising Muslims, Maharastrians and others. Therefore, Sir, when their stand on the question of these three firkas became untenable, they took up the question of a corridor. Anybody with a knowledge of corridors knows how difficult the question of corridors is. Danzig had a corridor and there was the question of corridor across the plains of Ganges connecting the Sindhu and the Brahmaputra. Corridors are cases which should never be supported. When Mr. Justice Misra took up the census figures as basis, some members say that the census figures are not reliable. It is unfortunate. If the census figures of 1951 are not held to be correct, let us take the census figures of 1931 or even 1921. This is a serious matter and it is a surprise for us that some people take up such a stand on census figures on which there should not be any doubt. We should always rely upon the census figures. Sir, it has been lightly talked

18th July 1953]

[Dr. R. Nagan Gouda]

about that there should be a plebiscite in Bellary. Before Mr. Justice Misra's report came, we in Bellary, let me tell Mr. Viswanatham, have lived in peace and amity and we have loved our Andhras as our brothers and for years past there have been no riots in Bellary. Now the rival claims on the division of Bellary district have brought about feelings which are to say the least unfortunate. Bellary is an agricultural taluk and a great majority of the people live in the villages and supply goods to the businessmen in Bellary town. They always lived in peace. Now, Sir, our friends are asking for a plebiscite. It is fire they are playing with. Feelings have already been roused in Bellary town on the question of language. Friendly relations have given way to bitterness. Things have become difficult. Now the members are asking for a plebiscite. Mr. Viswanatham who has been contesting elections a number of times knows what a plebiscite means. Even in the matter of elections to panchayat boards, feelings get roused, we know how many questions were put to the Hon. Minister for Local Administration about the number of quarrels and broken heads. Now, why do you want a plebiscite in Bellary taluk? Can't you depend upon the census figures? Mr. Viswanatham says, we can find out the people's opinion. Well, if census figures do not reveal the people's opinion regarding what languages they speak, how else are we going to find out their opinion? To conduct a plebiscite is very difficult. I, in all earnestness, appeal to the Members of this House to accept and depend upon the census figures rather than on a plebiscite."

MR. SPEAKER:—"It is already nearing 1 o'clock. I want to know whether we can finish this clause at a stretch and adjourn."

HON. MEMBERS:—"It is lunch-time, Sir. Let us adjourn."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I heard that it was the Hon. Speaker's suggestion to continue the session and finish the clause, so that hon. Members may go away for lunch and come back for voting. Let us finish the clause completely now itself with no afternoon session."

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA:—"Sir, the question of Bellary taluk has been gone into in great detail by Mr Justice Misra also. With reference to the three firkas in Bellary taluk,

SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR:—"On a point of order, Sir. Most of the hon. Members in this House are under the impression that the session will be over by 1 o'clock. We did not take our lunch and if we continue indefinitely it will be very difficult to give attention to the discussion."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"It is not a point of order. It is a request to the Chair. Why was it called a point of order to the detriment of the speech? It is quite wrong to call every thing a point of order and interrupt speeches."

(The hon. Member Sri T. C. Narayana Nambiar was seen standing.)

[18th July 1953]

MR. SPEAKER :—" I have consulted your Leader."

MR. T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR :—" It is not a question of consulting our Leader. It is a question of hunger."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" We thought the whole discussion would be over. As speeches may have to be made and amendments are to be put to vote, we may have to sit up to 2-30 p.m. At least five of the amendments may come up for division."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" It is better, we sit at a stretch and finish this clause. We need not have the afternoon session."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Only to-day we will have to sit for longer hours."

1 p.m. SRI G. LATCHANNA :—" Mr. Speaker, it is better you fix a time-limit. We also want to know when the morning session would finish."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I am not going to allow any hon. Member to speak. The Hon. Dr. Nagan Gouda will continue. Then the Hon. the Leader of the House will reply. I think we shall finish this by 2 o'clock."

* THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—" The question of plebiscite is not a very simple matter. It cannot be so lightly treated. So far as the Bellary taluk is concerned, a judicial enquiry has already been held by a person of the rank of the Chief Justice of a High Court. The Judge had reported his findings and the same had been accepted by the Government of India. I see no reason why we should raise up that question now. It is only because of the working of some Andhra protagonists that we have of late witnessed the unfortunate happenings in Bellary, which had so long remained calm. I agree with Mr. M. V. Krishna Rao that we should not go on encouraging an unending strife. I am strongly of the opinion that the Bellary question should be left out of our discussion. The amendment of the Leader of the House should make it clear that the question of Bellary should not be included in any reference to the Boundary Commission. Let not the chapter of Bellary be re-opened when its fate had already been decided on a judicial level.

" My learned friend Mr. Prakasam wonders why the name of Mysore had been brought into the picture. After all, Sir, Mysore is our immediate neighbour. When the separation of Andhra State has taken place, the residuary Madras State cannot carry on the administration of the far removed Bellary district. It will not be administratively convenient for them to do so. We naturally belong to Mysore and there we go. The Government of India requested Mysore to take these Kannada taluks. They have agreed and we should be thankful to them. Therefore, Sir, let me conclude that this question of Bellary which has been gone into in great detail should be let out of the scope of the Boundary Commission."

18th July 1953]

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ One point, Sir. Has the Hon. Minister for Agriculture read what Mr. Misra himself says. ‘ Short of a plebiscite, the only course left open for me was to decide in favour of the majority opinion ’.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ I am not replying, Sir. The Hon. the Leader of the House will do so. I am rising only to offer a few explanations with reference to the amendments that had been raised and clarify or at any rate obtain clarification and help in clarification. Let me make one point clear. All these clamours and counter-clamours had been raised because of a wrong impression. I want to remove that erroneous impression. It has been taken for granted by all the hon. Members (at any rate I believe so), who have spoken, that the creation of the Andhra State as a Part A State from the composite Part A State of Madras marks a full-fledged recognition and execution of the plan for the formation of linguistic States. Hence all these difficulties have arisen. Nothing of that sort of commitment had been entered into by the Government of India. The Government of India had announced that the whole question of the reconstitution of the boundaries of States would be gone into by a Commission that would be shortly appointed. But meanwhile in view of the situation that has developed in respect of the Andhra State separation from Madras, a decision had been made in respect of that only. That does not mean that the Government of India had totally accepted the principle of linguistic redistribution of all the States in the Indian Union. The separation of the Andhra territory from the Madras State closely follows the J.V.P. Report. This separation, I use the word ‘ separation,’ of Andhra from Madras State never forms part of the general question of the formation of linguistic States. Let that be clearly understood. That general question of the redistribution of the States on a linguistic basis is a thing for the Committee that is going to be appointed shortly, to go through in detail. Hon. Members should understand the principle behind the present Andhra Bill being discussed here in this House. It is to cover that particular aspect in our Constitution which requires (under Article 3) the concerned State Legislatures’ opinion thereon in respect of the Bill. That is the genesis behind the present Andhra Bill being discussed here in the Madras Legislature and Mysore also, for the States that are concerned are Madras, Andhra and Mysore. Let us see the Long Title. What does it say? I shall read it. It begins like this—

‘ A Bill to provide for the formation of the State of Andhra, the increasing of the area of the State of Mysore and the diminishing of the area of the State of Madras, and for matters connected therewith.’

The wording of the Long Title clearly explains that the Andhra State is being formed by the separation of the Telugu districts from Madras. That is why I say this has nothing to do with the general plan of the formation of linguistic States, which is to be thoroughly gone into by a Committee. That is why I feel that we cannot go into the details of that general question. This Bill has been referred to us for eliciting the opinion of the House under Article 3. We cannot cover any more ground. For instance we cannot go into the

[18th July 1953]

question of the disintegration of Hyderabad or Mysore or things like that. Therefore, it is that I say Government are unable to accept the suggestions of hon. Members that we could discuss the question of 'Visala Andhra' also here by way of amendments. That is a thing to be left over for discussion in Parliament (and not here, mind you) after the report of the Committee I had referred to previously will be received in Parliament. After the report is received in Parliament it is perfectly open for hon. Members concerned in the House of the People to discuss that question threadbare. It is not for this Assembly to express its individual opinion without taking the opinions of the other States which are intimately connected in this matter. We have our own limitations. That is why I say the Government are unable to accept the amendments which cover far wide a ground. At any rate let me not be mistaken as though I am preventing hon. Members from moving their amendments. By all means, if the House so desires, let their amendments be put to vote. I do not stand in the way. But the only request I would make the hon. Members is 'permit us to withdraw our amendment' in view of the majority of hon. Members having not clearly understood the purpose behind our amendment. It looks as though hon. Members have not clearly understood what we mean by our amendment. In order to explain that only I had risen. Seeing as I do the hon. Members wanting to press amendments 10, 21, 36 and 47, which cover a field beyond our jurisdiction, the only course left for the Government, is I think, to withdraw ours. That is how the position stands as a matter of fact. Bellary friends have opposed the very idea that Bellary should even by interpretation come within the meaning of any amendment.

"Yesterday, Mr. Viswanatham wanted some time for them to present an agreed amendment on this boundary question. After all nights' labour he now comes with an agreed amendment (at any rate he says so) and at the same time he says that they would press amendments 10, 21, 36 and 47. Then what is the agreement they had arrived at? Amendments 10, 21, 36 and 47 refer to the border areas of not only Andhra but Mysore, Madras, Madhya Pradesh, Hyderabad and Orissa. How are we, members of this House, justified in discussing that question and surely it is not for this Assembly to offer any opinion in this matter without the respective State Legislatures discussing the same? I had already explained that we are not justified in discussing the same. It is for the House of the People to discuss after receiving that Committee's report, to which I had already referred. We cannot discuss inter-State affairs. It is for the Parliament to discuss them. The whole question would have to be gone into by the Committee that is going to be appointed. Let me now come to Sri Viswanatham's amendment.

1-10 P.M. "Mr. Speaker, Sir, if Sri Viswanatham's motion in the amended form refers to only adjustments that may be necessary in respect of the boundaries of the Andhra State, I could understand, but there is no necessity to put in 'Madras and Mysore'; if it is only in regard to the boundary that impinges on and is contiguous to

18th July 1953] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

the Andhra State, there is no necessity for it. Also he wants to introduce 'claims and disputes in respect of . . .' whereas the Government amendment is with reference to disputes that have already arisen, which means that claims which have not yet even come to notice should be considered by the Boundary Commission. It may be that Sri Viswanatham does not mean all that I have read in this motion but it must also be taken into consideration because if the Government forward the amended resolution in this form, they will be responsible for re-opening the whole thing which would mean that the entire decision, the entire scheme and the plan are re-opened once again before the Boundary Commission. I feel that the Government of India would consider that this Government has over-stepped its responsibility and duty in making such a wide proposal. For my part, I would request the Speaker to allow the Government to withdraw their resolution if all the other amendments are also to be put up and I would like the House to give permission for it, but suppose the House does not give permission, it would be put to vote as it stands, but not with these amendments."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" With regard to the text I have given would it suit the Hon. the Chief Minister if instead we say 'adjustment regarding boundaries of the Andhra State with the Residuary State of Madras and the Mysore State'."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Even there more could be read. Men imagine that there is lot of gold in Kolar still and that is the trouble."

(Sri T. Prakasam rose in his seat.)

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member, Sri Prakasam, spoke yesterday; does he want to speak a second time on this matter? "

SRI T. PRAKASAM :—" This is the second time that my learned Friend has spoken on the same thing and by way of final reply, he has said this, Sir."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" You took the whole thing into consideration last night and you asked me to consider it and I have considered the thing and my consideration must be expressed."

SRI T. PRAKASAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Chief Minister said that this is not a linguistic matter, but my point is that it is a linguistic matter and if he wants to say this now at the close of this discussion . . ."

* **THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI** :—" What I said has not been understood properly by the hon. Member; I said that this should not be considered as the formation of an Andhra State on the ground of a complete linguistic re-distribution that misconception brings in the question of Visalandhra here. I say, Sir, that to the extent that claims have been understood, and disputed all these few years, they conceded that the undisputed Telugu-speaking areas in and of the Madras State may be formed into an Andhra

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [18th July 1953]

State without going into the question of forming all the Telugu-speaking areas of India into an Andhra State. You may have a bigger Andhra State later on."

SRI T. PRAKASAM :—" It is on that point, Sir, that I wanted to point out to my learned Friend that the basis of the whole of this Bill is the statement made by the Prime Minister in Parliament; he stated that the Telugu-speaking areas must be brought into the new State that would be formed and for Telugu-speaking areas, so far as this Bill is concerned, the basis is one of language and that is how all these amendments have come in.

" So far as my amendments are concerned, I say that Mysore should not have been brought in here. The Long Title is wrong and no other State should have come in here because it must be a purely Andhra Bill. I fail to understand, Sir, how the question relating to Mysore could be decided by the Government of India or by this House? So, Sir, Mysore must be omitted altogether from this Bill wherever it occurs. My Friend says 'Mysore' must be there and the assignment of Bellary to Mysore must remain because it has been decided by Mr. Misra and it could not be reopened as it is final. Constitutionally speaking, Sir, it is a wrong view. An Andhra Bill must be a purely Andhra Bill; it cannot be a partly Andhra and partly Mysore Bill. I feel that we should proceed on the basis of the *status quo* before the Misra award; that I feel, is the only course that should be properly followed and we should not start with the assignment of Bellary to Mysore as an accomplished fact, saying that Mysore has been given away and it is final and nothing could be said or raised about it. That is why, Sir, for the last two or three days discussions have been going on for a Boundary Commission that would be appointed. I submit, Sir, that the whole thing has been brought into such a confusion by my Hon. Friend by saying that Mysore must be there for some purpose although we were not parties to the Mysore business."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Prime Minister's statement regarding the formation of the Andhra State has been referred to on the floor of the House by my old Friend Sri Prakasam and I shall read out the exact sentence to which he was referring—

" The basic considerations which have to be kept in view are that the Andhra State has to be established and that it should consist of the Telugu-speaking areas of the present Madras State."

That, Sir, is the categorical statement made by the Prime Minister. That is why the Chief Minister observed that we have got to confine ourselves to the Telugu-speaking areas in the present Madras State and it would be outside the scope of the Bill and of our discussions if we should deal with matters relating to territories outside the Madras State. As a matter of fact, he tried to clear the confusion which was persisting in the minds of hon. Member that this is not a question concerning the formation of Andhra State as a whole taking in all the Telugu-speaking areas in the country. It is not so because for the present it is to be confined to the Telugu-speaking areas in the Madras State only."

18th July 1953]

SRI T. PRAKASAM :—" Not in the whole of the country, but in Madras State only."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Yes, it is only with reference to the Telugu-speaking areas in Madras State. With reference to the adjustment of boundaries in respect of other States either on the linguistic principle or any other principle, a statement has been made by the Prime Minister that a Commission is going to be appointed to go into the whole question of the redistribution of the boundaries of the different States. The conditions which have to be taken into account in respect of this redistribution of the boundaries have also been stated. Therefore, there is no use now in talking about various areas which are either in Mysore, Hyderabad or Orissa. I am sure they will be dealt with by the Commission which is going to be appointed. In considering clauses 3 and 4 we have therefore to confine ourselves only to the areas contained within the Madras State. As regards the other amendments, one set of amendments are in respect of the territories which should go to form the Andhra State and another set of amendments have been given by my hon. Friend, Sri T. Prakasam, that the whole of the Bellary district should be included in the Andhra State. There are also certain amendments to the effect that the seven taluks may go to Mysore, but, in respect of the Bellary taluk, three firkas should be separated and tacked on to the three other taluks which go to Andhra. In respect of all these amendments, I would respectfully submit that it is now too late to ask that the whole of the Bellary district should be included in the Andhra State. It has been categorically stated that only the undisputed areas, namely, the eleven Telugu districts and the three taluks of Alur, Adoni and Rayadrug taluks of Bellary district, would go into the Andhra State. As regards Bellary taluk, my Friend, the Hon. Dr. R. Nagan Gouda has pointed out how there has been no claim till recently to the Bellary town or the Bellary taluk, and that it is only a recent claim. It is not as if the matter stands there. Justice Wanchoo has gone into the matter and Justice Misra has also gone into this matter. Therefore, on the Government side, we cannot now agree to the three firkas of the Bellary taluk, or the whole of the Bellary taluk or the whole of the Bellary district going into the Andhra State. This is the position of the Government because we have to take note of certain things which have happened. Whether they are final or provisional, we have to abide by them. It may be that later on, either through a Boundary Commission or a plebiscite, the Andhra State may be able to get either the whole of the district of Bellary, or the taluk of Bellary or at least the three firkas of Bellary taluk. It is not a matter which concerns us now. There are some decisions which may be provisional but we have to abide by them. Therefore, any amendment which would suggest that these three firkas or the taluk of Bellary or the whole of the Bellary district should go into the Andhra State cannot be accepted by the Government. The other amendments relating to disputes arising out of border claims and the appointment of a Boundary Commission to go into the question of any area either

1-20
a.m.

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

[18th July 1953]

in Mysore, Hyderabad, Orissa or Madhya Pradesh, would, I respectfully submit, be equally out of place because this Bill is confined only to the territories which are now contained in the present Madras State. So, whatever reference we may make in regard to areas outside the Madras State would, I submit again, be quite out of place."

SRI T. PRAKASAM :—" Sir, when Mysore was introduced in this Bill, it became necessary for our Friends to introduce other States like Hyderabad, etc. (The Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachari: 'I cannot agree.') These are not really amendments, but only expression of our views. We are calling them amendments for the sake of convenience."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Sir, I am not disputing the right of any hon. Member to bring any amendment but, as Government, we cannot accept any of these amendments because they go beyond the scope of the Bill and we cannot be a party to that. I am making my submission only in this respect."

SRI T. PRAKASAM :—" Sir, we have had discussions till now on all the amendments. All have been accepted and the discussions have been carried on on this basis. It is not for the Government now to say that they cannot accept them. They will have to be put before the House and its opinion must be recorded."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Sir, I am not stating that these amendments should not be put to the vote of the House. I am only explaining how the Government are unable to support them. In these circumstances, they have to be viewed only in this light. As far as the Government's amendment is concerned, as already stated by the Hon. the Chief Minister, if the House gives permission, I would like to withdraw it and if the House is not willing to give permission to withdraw, I have no objection to its being voted upon but we do not want to stand by that amendment now. That is all I have to say and I would request the House to give me permission to withdraw the amendment."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The Hon. the Leader of the House wants to withdraw the amendment. I think the House gives the necessary permission."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, we are after all only expressing our views here. The amendment has been put before the House and I do not see why it should be withdrawn."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I would like to know what the hon. Member wants."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" He need not withdraw it. (An hon. Member: 'The Government are not in need of any advice'.) I am not seeking to advise the Government. They are above advice and I am only requesting the Hon. the Chief Minister to consider whether he cannot accept my suggestion not to withdraw the amendment."

18th July 1953]

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Sir, if there is any desire that this amendment should be carried through, let Sri T. Viswanatham not want to change its wording."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Probably, Sri T. Viswanatham wants time to consider."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, there are several parties here and I shall have to consult on this side."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Sir, I submit that the question before the House is whether it will give the necessary permission to withdraw the amendment or not. We need not be discussing it for all time whatever be the number of parties."

MR. SPEAKER :—" May I know what the hon. Member, Sri T. Viswanatham, now desires."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" We shall not allow the Hon. the Leader of the House to withdraw the amendment."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I will then put it to the vote of the House but before doing so I would like to know what will be the position of the other amendments if this motion is carried."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" They will have to be withdrawn."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, the contents of this amendment are different from the other amendments."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I therefore consider that it will be better to put all the other amendments to the vote of the House and take this up at the end."

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—" Sir, there are certain other amendments which may be pressed to a division which would necessarily mean a lot of time."

MR. SPEAKER :—" A division will take only about 10 minutes."

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—" Sir, it is already very late and it is very difficult for us to continue."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Sir, with great deference to my Friends opposite or alongside of me, I submit that we should not indulge in such dilatory tactics. We have finished the discussion and we have only to take opinions."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" Sir, it is not dilatory tactics. I know that we ourselves are going to press for a division in regard to five of the amendments and I am sure that other parties also press for their contentions. The point that the hon. Member, Sri G. Latchanna, raised is that it is difficult to finish all these divisions within the short time at our disposal now. It would be better for us to adjourn now and meet again. It is not a question

[Sri T. Nagi Reddi]

[18th July 1953]

of dilatory tactics and I am sorry the Hon. the Chief Minister used those words. We are as much interested in finishing it but we want to decide conscientiously and properly."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I know that the other side is wanting it but they do not know how to do it."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"Sir, we do not want to rush through as the Hon. Chief Minister wants us to do. We would like to go carefully and as amicably as possible. There is no question of dilatory tactics and it is wrong to use that word."

1-30 P.m. SRI K. VARADACHARI:—"As it was said that voting would begin at 2 o'clock, several members have gone for lunch. Let us postpone the voting, Sir, to Monday morning."

MR. SPEAKER:—"It is not possible. We shall meet again at . . ."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"I must make the position clear. Some of the hon. Members want to press for division. Each division will take ten minutes."

"Even if the voting continues up to 3 o'clock are we to continue to sit?"

AN HON. MEMBER:—"Let us meet again at 3 o'clock. It is too late. We are very hungry."

SRI T. PRAKASAM:—"At the very outset, I wanted to point out that it would take a long time for voting and divisions. It cannot be finished within five or ten minutes. Let us adjourn now for lunch and meet again at 3 o'clock."

SRI K. KOTI REDDI:—"You, Sir, said that the voting will begin at 2 o'clock . . ."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Let us come to some arrangement."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"It entirely depends upon the convenience of hon. Members. Opinions seem to be divided. One section says, 'Let us now finish the voting and be free for the rest of the day.' There is another section of opinion which wants to go for lunch immediately."

MR. SPEAKER:—"If there is division, hon. Members will have to sit even up to 3 o'clock."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"I wish to leave it to the House to decide."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"It is ordinary commonsense in all these matters that instead of discussing things we must do them. Therefore, I suggest that we proceed with the voting, and then if we want to disperse, let us disperse and come back at 3 o'clock."

18th July 1953]

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" Sir, instead of beginning to divide and then dispersing, why not we meet at 3 o'clock and proceed with division continuously? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" If it is only a case of the demands of stomach, then what I said is common-sense."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" It is as much a case of the stomach as of tiredness on the other side. It is also a case of some Members wanting to finish the whole thing now and be free for the rest of the day. My point is this. If we begin to divide now setting a time-limit and disperse to come back to divide again, I do not think that it will be a proper thing. I wish the Government and other Members will accept the suggestion to disperse now for lunch and meet again at 3 o'clock and finish the whole business by 5 o'clock."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" By this time, five divisions could have been finished! "

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—" It will be proper and just to allow us to go for lunch now and to have another session in the evening."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I will continue to put the amendments to the vote of the House till 2 o'clock, and if we are not in a position to finish the voting on all the amendments, we shall adjourn and meet again at 3 o'clock."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" It is almost impossible to finish the whole thing by 2 o'clock."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Then we shall adjourn now and meet again at 3 p.m."

The House then adjourned for lunch.

(After lunch—3 p.m.)

The House reassembled after lunch and the voting on the amendments^a was taken up.

The amendments standing in the name of Sri D. Krishnamurthy (No. 9), Sri G. Latchanna (No. 12), Sri M. Rajeswara Rao (No. 13), Sri G. C. Kondayya (No. 17), and Sri K. T. Kosalram (No. 18) were deemed to have been withdrawn as the Members who moved the amendments were not in their places.

The amendments standing in the name of Sri K. Varadachari (No. 10), Sri T. Prakasam (No. 11), Sri Ijari Sirasappa (No. 14), Sri V. Gopalakrishnaiah (No. 16) and Sri E. L. Raghava Mudaliar (No. 20) were put and lost.

[18th July 1953]

The following amendment (No. 21) standing in the name of Sri T. N. Venkatasubba Reddi was put and declared lost :—

Add the following proviso to clause 3, sub-clause (1) :—

“ Provided that the Government of India do take necessary steps to finally settle the boundaries of the Madras, Andhra and Mysore, Orissa, Hyderabad and Madhya Pradesh States, either by mutual agreement between the States concerned or by a boundary commission or commissions and that the districts concerned may thereupon be reformed accordingly.”

A poll was demanded and the House divided thus—

Ayes 122.

Sri K. Adikesavala Naidu.
 „ K. Appala Naidu.
 „ Bojja Appalaswami.
 „ Appa Rao Bahadur, Rajah Meka Rangayya.
 „ T. S. Ardhanari.
 „ Y. Audinarayana Reddi.
 „ K. „apanna Dora.
 „ G. Bapanayya.
 „ P. Bapu Naidu.
 „ D. Basivi Reddi.
 „ Chandra Kamalingaiah.
 „ V. Chidanandam.
 „ P. Chinnama Reddi.
 „ D. Dasaratharamaiah Naidu.
 „ M. Dorakannu.
 „ M. Gangappa.
 „ B. Gangayya Naidu.
 „ Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah.
 „ P. K. Gopalakrishnan.
 „ P. Gopalakrishna Reddi.
 „ K. P. Gopalan.
 „ K. C. Gopalan Unni.
 „ K. Govinda Rao.
 „ M. Hanumantha Rao.
 „ G. Joseph.
 „ M. Kalyanasundram.
 „ C. Kandasami.
 „ M. Kandaswami Kandar.
 „ C. H. Kanaran.
 „ S. Kasireddy.
 „ G. C. Kondayya.
 „ Pragada Kotaiah.
 „ K. Koti Reddi.

Srimathi Thamma Kotamma Reddi.

Sri Raja V. V. Krishnam Raju Bahadur.

„ B. Krishnamurthy Rao.
 „ R. Krishnan.
 „ M. Kune Rao.
 „ E. T. Kunhan.
 „ L. Lakshmana Das.
 „ T. Lakshmi Narayana Reddi.
 „ M. Lakshmanaswamy.
 „ D. Lakshmayya.
 „ R. Lakshmi Narasimham Dora.
 „ B. Lakshminarasa Raju.
 „ G. Latchana.
 „ V. Madanagopal.
 „ K. Madhavan Nambiar.
 „ K. Malakondayya.
 „ T. Mallayya.
 „ G. Nagabhushanam.

Sri T. Nagi Reddi.

„ N. V. L. Narasimha Rao.
 „ P. Narasimha Reddi.
 „ T. C. Narayana Nambiar.
 „ S. Narayanappa.
 „ M. Narayanasamy.
 „ Asi, Neeladri Rao Reddi.
 „ K. V. S. Padmanabha Raju.
 „ N. K. Palanisami.

The Hon. Sri S. B. P. Pattabhi Rama Rao.

Sri M. Pentannaaidu.
 „ T. Potha Raju.
 „ T. Prakasam.
 „ C. Pulla Reddi.
 „ P. Pundarikashacharyulu.
 „ K. Rajagopala Rao.
 „ K. T. Raju.
 „ N. Ramabhadra Raju.
 „ D. Ramabrahmam.
 „ P. S. Ramachandra Rao.
 „ B. Ramakrishna Reddi.
 „ S. Ramalingam.
 „ H. Ramalinga Reddi.
 „ G. Rama Rao.
 „ N. V. Rama Rao.
 „ P. Rama Rao.
 „ V. Rama Rao.
 „ K. V. Ramasamy.
 „ K. V. Ramesam.
 „ K. Ranga Rao.
 „ P. Sangam Naidu.
 „ B. Sankarayya.
 „ K. Santhappa.
 „ G. Sattyanarayana.
 „ H. Satyanarayana Dora.
 „ D. Seetharamiah.
 „ N. Sivaraj.
 „ N. Sivarami Reddi.
 „ G. Sivasankara Reddi.
 „ V. Sri Krishna.
 „ M. Srungaram.
 „ K. Subba Reddi.
 „ C. Subbarayudu.
 „ A. K. Subbiah.
 „ R. B. V. Sudarsana Varma.
 „ P. Suryachandra Rao.
 „ K. Suryanarayana.
 „ Suryanarayana Raju, Raja Sag.
 „ G. Suryanarayana.
 „ P. Syamsundra Rao.
 „ P. Thimma Reddi.
 „ S. Vadivelu.

18th July 1953]

Ayes 122—cont.

Sri K. Varadaachari.
 „ M. Veerabhadram.
 „ K. Veeranna Padal.
 „ K. V. Vema Reddy.
 „ S. Vemiah.
 „ K. Venkaiah.
 „ R. Venkata Jagga Rao.
 „ Alluri Venkataramaraju.
 „ P. Venkatasiviah.
 „ M. Venkatasubba Reddi.

Sri T. N. Venkatasubba Reddi.
 „ N. Venkatayya.
 „ P. Venkatesha Sholagar.
 „ Venkateswarlu, Pillalammarri.
 „ K. Venkatarayana Dora.
 „ Venkatrao, Saka.
 „ P. Venkatswami Reddi.
 „ T. Viswanatham.
 „ G. Yellamanda Reddi.

3-20
p.m.*Noes 121.*

Sri S. T. Adityan.
 „ C. Ahmed Kutty.
 „ L. Anandan.
 „ T. Anantha Pai.
 „ K. Aranganathan.
 „ Ardhanareswara Gounder.
 „ S. Arumugam.
 „ S. R. Arumugam.
 „ V. Arumugam.
 „ A. Ayyaru.
 „ A. Ayyanar.
 „ V. Balakrishnan.
 „ B. Bhakthavatsalu Naidu.
 „ K. H. Bomman.
 „ M. Chadayan.
 „ S. Chellapandian.
 „ P. Chellathurai.
 „ O. Chengam Pillay.
 „ V. S. Chinnaswami Naidu.
 „ Chinnathambi Thevar.
 Dr. G. Chitrabalam.
 Sri Ar. A. Rm. Chokkalingam Chettiar.
 „ D. Dasarathan.
 „ S. Deivasigamony.
 „ M. Dharmalingam.
 „ T. P. Elumalai.
 „ W. J. Fernandez.
 „ K. Gajapathi Reddy.
 „ T. Ganapathy.
 „ G. Govindan.
 „ A. Govindasami Nayagar.
 „ A. K. Hanumantharaya Gounder.
 „ K. Ishwara.
 „ H. M. Jagannatham.
 „ T. M. Kaliannan.
 „ V. K. Kannan.
 „ P. G. Karuthiruman.
 „ M. K. Kempai Gounder.
 „ S. S. Kolkebail.
 „ K. T. Kosalam.
 „ K. Kotra Basavana Goud.
 The Hon. Dr. U. Krishna Rao.
 Sri P. S. Krishnasami Ayyangar.
 „ V. Krishnaswami Padayachi.
 „ Kunhi Mohamed Shafee.
 „ R. Kuppaswami.
 The Hon. Sri K. P. Kuttikrishnan
 Nair.
 Sri K. S. Lakshminpathy Naicker.
 „ N. Mahalingam.
 „ M. P. Mangala Gounder.
 „ M. Manickasundaram.
 „ P. G. Manickam.
 „ Y. Manjaya Shetty.
 „ A. K. Masilamani Chettiar.
 „ M. S. Mogral.

Sri Mohamed Salih Maraikayar.
 „ N. Mounaguruswamy Naidu.
 „ M. S. Muniswami Pillay.
 „ C. Muthiah Pillai.
 „ V. Muthu.
 „ T. D. Muthukumaraswamy Naidu.
 The Hon. Dr. R. Nagan Gouda.
 Sri P. S. Nalla Gounder.
 „ B. K. Nallasamy.
 „ O. A. Nanjappa.
 „ R. A. Nataraja Mudaliar.
 „ S. Pakkirisami Pillai.
 „ L. C. Pais.
 „ M. Palaniandi.
 The Hon. Sri V. C. Palanisami Goun-
 der.
 Sri V. K. Palanisami Gounder.
 „ S. Panchaksharam.
 „ B. Parameswaran.
 „ S. Parameswarappa.
 „ M. P. Periasami.
 „ S. Radhakrishnan.
 „ E. L. Raghava Mudaliar.
 „ P. B. K. Rajachidambaram.
 „ N. Rajagopal.
 „ C. Rajam Ramasami.
 „ K. Rajaram.
 „ T. K. Rama.
 „ M. R. Ramachandran.
 „ A. Ramachandra Reddiar.
 „ N. Ramakrishna Ayyar.
 „ V. K. Ramasamy Mudaliar.
 „ A. Ramasami Thevar.
 „ R. Rangasami Gounder.
 „ P. Rangaswami Reddiar.
 „ N. Rathina Gounder.
 „ A. M. Sambandam.
 „ A. Sambasivam.
 „ G. Samia Koorayar.
 „ E. K. Sankara Varma Raja.
 „ K. M. Seethi.
 „ P. Selvaraj.
 „ M. G. Shanker.
 „ T. Shanmugham.
 The Hon. Sri A. B. Shetty.
 Sri R. Siddanna Goud.
 „ Sirasappa, Ijari.
 „ Somasundara Gounder.
 „ S. Somayajulu.
 Dr. T. S. Soundaram Ramachandran.
 The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam.
 Sri M. P. Subramaniam.
 „ I. K. Subramania Pillay.
 „ N. N. Suvama.
 „ R. Thangavelu.
 „ S. P. Thangavelu.

3-30
p.m.

[18th July 1953]

Noes 121—cont.

Sri K. Uppi.
 „ B. Vaikunta Baliga.
 „ T. R. Varadan.
 „ S. Venkatarama Ayyar.
 „ O. Venkatasubba Reddi.
 „ K. Venkataramana Gowda.

The Hon. Sri K. Venkatswami Naidu.
 Sri Venugopalakrishnaswamy.
 „ K. Vinayakam.
 „ S. C. Virupakshiah.
 „ K. R. Viswanatham.

Neutrals 4.

Dr. K. B. Menon.
 Sri K. T. Sridharan.

Sri P. Kunhirama Kidav.
 „ C. Velukkan.

Ayes 122; Noes 121; Neutrals 4.

The amendment was carried.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Now that this amendment has been passed, what is the position of the other amendments? ”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ I believe the other amendments also will have to be put to the vote of the House, as certain amendments lay stress on particular points. The amendment that has been passed is a general one.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member should not take it as an amendment; it is only a view. But there are certain amendments which actually form part of the amendment that has been passed.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Some amendments will have to be ruled out of order and some will have to be put to vote.”

Then the amendments standing in the name of Sri V. R. Nagarajan (No. 25), Sri K. Varadachari (Nos. 26 and 31), Sri G. Latchanna (No. 27), Sri T. Prakasam (No. 28), Sri G. C. Kondayya (No. 30), Sri M. Hanumantha Rao (No. 35), and Sri T. Nagi Reddi (No. 36) were, by leave, withdrawn.

The amendments standing in the name of Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu (No. 32) and Sri P. Pundarikakshacharyulu (No. 33) were put and lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I am going to put the amendment standing in the name of Sri M. Kalyanasundaram (No. 34) to vote.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Sir, some of the amendments are covered by the amendment which has already been passed. I submit that such amendments may be ruled out of order.”

The amendment of Sri M. Kalyanasundaram (No. 34) was put and lost.

The amendment of Sri T. Nagi Reddi (No. 37) was put and lost.

18th July 1953]

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Sir, I want to make a verbal change in my amendment (No. 38)."

MR. SPEAKER :—" If it is a verbal change, I will accept it." 3-40 p.m.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" The first four lines of the amendment are to be omitted."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, he wants to leave out certain words. The House having earlier accepted amendment No. 21 of Sri T. N. Venkatasubba Reddi, this will be superfluous and out of order also. This has already been covered."

MR. SPEAKER :—" This is not covered."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" Sir, this is a fundamental change. The operative part of the amendment is taken away. This is not a verbal change, and it cannot be accepted."

MR. SPEAKER :—" It is only a verbal change."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" Please allow me, Sir, to explain. The Government have already accepted an amendment and acted upon that for the purpose . . . (Interruption.) Every district is a disputed district. When I have raised a point of order . . ." (Interruptions.)

RAJA MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR OF CHETTINAD :—" On a point of order, Sir. I submit to the Speaker that the question whether a particular change is verbal or not is solely within the discretion of the Chair, and is not to be questioned by any Member of this House."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, the point that I wish to make is very important. Even the Anantapur district is an undisputed district in the sense of Chittoor being an undisputed district. In Anantapur, there are boundaries which are disputed. The very question of dispute was there in the amendment. The amended amendment is a very fundamental change from the original amendment. The first four lines of the amendment are sought to be removed now after so much discussion has taken place. The discussion has overruled this fundamental change. The amendment is sought to be made for the sake of voting. I think this should not be allowed. The amendment without the verbal change can be put to vote. A fundamental change is now sought to be made in the amendment, and this should not be allowed."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" It is only a verbal change. Certain reasons have been given in the first four lines of the amendment. They are now sought to be removed. What we recommend to Parliament is only material. There is no material change in the amended amendment."

[18th July 1953]

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—" Sir, here is an amendment moved by Sri Vinayakam. The amendment has been discussed, and it was before the Assembly for some time. At the time of voting, no amendment to the amendment can be moved. What is more? The Leader of the House has no business to make any kind of suggestion. Even a verbal change must be an amendment. I submit that everything must be moved as an amendment. No amendment has been moved to the amendment of Sri Vinayakam. When voting is about to take place, no verbal change can be accepted. This is my point."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" In addition to what my hon. Friend Sri C. V. K. Rao said, I submit that the omission of four lines altogether cannot, I say with due deference to the Chair, be considered a verbal amendment."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" One word may change the whole thing, or four lines may be superfluous and therefore immaterial. We should not be guided by the fact that it is four lines or one word. We must see whether any material alteration of the amendment is made. I submit that there is no material change."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" If the amendment is not materially changed, as the Leader of the House says, it is correct. But that is not the case. The hon. Member has given so many reasons for the amendment. But the operative portion is being omitted now. If the first four lines are omitted, the material portion is affected. That is why I say that it is a material change."

(Some hon. Members were seen standing in their places.)

MR. SPEAKER :—" I have allowed enough time. Everybody has explained the amendment. I have allowed the verbal change. I am going to put it to the vote of the House."

The amendment of Sri K. Vinayakam (No. 38) as amended was then put to the House—

" That this House recommends that a boundary commission be appointed to examine the claims of Tamilians in the Chittoor district."

The amendment was declared carried. The Division bell was then rung, and the doors were ordered to be closed.

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" May I know who demanded a poll, Sir? "

MR. SPEAKER :—" Some hon. Member demanded it. If nobody wants a poll, I take it that the amendment is carried. The amendment is carried. I will put the next amendment to the vote of the House."

The amendment of Sri K. Venkiah (No. 39) was put and lost.

18th July 1953]

SRI L. LAKSHMAN DASS :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, in view of the amendment of Mr. Venkatasubba Reddi having been carried, I do not press my amendment."

The amendments of Sri L. Lakshman Dass (No. 41), Sri K. Ramaiah Chowdary (No. 42) and Sri G. Yallamanda Reddi (No. 43) were, by leave, withdrawn.

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" Sir, the amendment of Sri N. Gopala Menon must be put to vote."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Am I to understand that the House has not given permission to Mr. Gopala Menon to withdraw his amendment? "

SRI N. GOPALA MENON :—" Sir, let me make my position clear. I find that amendment No. 21, which is a very clear and comprehensive one, includes practically all that is contained in my amendment (No. 44). So, I thought there was no use in pressing my amendment."

The amendment (No. 44) was, by leave, withdrawn.

SRI K. VARADACHARI :—" Sir, I press my amendment (No. 45)."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" A similar amendment has already been lost, and, therefore, this amendment cannot be pressed. This is only a consequential amendment to amendments Nos. 10 and 13."

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—" On a point of order, Sir, can the Secretary to the Government intervene in the discussion? "

MR. SPEAKER :—" He is not at all intervening."

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—" I see that the Secretary to Government (Mr. Venkateswaran) is suggesting something to you, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Does the hon. Member think that I am taking lessons from the Secretary to the Government? Let the hon. Member first withdraw his statement."

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—" He has been standing there."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Does it mean that he is tutoring me? "

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—" I am prepared to withdraw, and I withdraw. But I must tell the Hon. Speaker that he was standing by the side of the Speaker."

MR. SPEAKER :—" He may be standing by my side. My clerk is standing by my side. But I am not tutored by him."

[Mr. Speaker]

[18th July 1953]

“ Now I would advise Mr. Varadachari to withdraw his amendment, the House having given its verdict on the previous amendments. The hon. Member cannot press his amendment now.”

SRI K. VARADACHARI :—“ I am not withdrawing the amendment.”

The amendment of Sri K. Varadachari (No. 45) was put and lost.

The amendments of Sri K. Varadachari (No. 46) and Sri T. Prakasam (No. 47) were, by leave, withdrawn.

The amendment of Sri K. Varadachari (No. 48) was put and lost.

3-50 The amendments of Sri G. Latchanna (No. 50) and Sri Ijari
p.m. Sirsappa (No. 51) were, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment No. 52.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ This amendment is similar to the one lost previously. So, I think the hon. Member is not pressing it.”

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ I am pressing it, Sir.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Does the hon. Member want a division on this? I want to know the opinion of the hon. Member Sri Nagi Reddi.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ I do not want a division, Sir.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Then, is he advising Sri Gopalakrishnaiah not to press it? ”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ It depends upon him. So far as I am concerned, I am not pressing it.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ May I advise Sri Gopalakrishnaiah not to press it? ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I think it is a consequential amendment. I cannot put this to the vote of the House. If amendment No. 16 had been accepted, this would be in order. But having lost amendment No. 16, the hon. Member cannot press this amendment.”

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ The amendment has been placed before the House already. When I press for a division, it cannot be said that it is out of order.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Where is it said that I should not consider it a second time? Now, I say it is clearly out of order.” (Laughter.)

18th July 1953]

The amendments of Sri G. Latchanna (No. 53) and of Sri P. Kotiah (No. 54) were, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment No. 55.

SRI S. S. KOLKEBAIL :—" I am pressing the amendment, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I have no objection to put it to the vote of the House. However, I wish to hear the Chief Minister on this matter."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" It is a separate amendment, Sir."

The amendment of Sri S. S. Kolkebañ (No. 55) was put and lost.

The Government amendment moved by the Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam (No. 55-A) was, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment No. 56.

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" On a point of information, Sir. Are we proceeding with the consideration of the Bill clause by clause? In the morning, we were given to understand . . ."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I told the House that we would sit and finish consideration of the clause. But not having finished it, we shall sit till 5 of the clock and see how far we progress."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" Will you, Sir, kindly take the other factor into consideration? In the morning we sat till nearly 2 p.m."

MR. SPEAKER :—" We can sit for one hour more. I am not going to make the House sit till 6 p.m."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" Important amendments are coming up."

SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBA REDDI :—" May I represent to you that we expected that the House was going to be adjourned now? All of us are really tired."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The House has not accepted my advice. My advice was that we should finish the consideration of the clause and adjourn once and for all. As the House has not accepted my advice, we shall have to sit till 5 p.m."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" I thought it was dilatory tactics, this morning. What else can it be except dilatory now? It is generally considered that even when a Court hears the whole case and puts off its judgment, it is objectable?"

[18th July 1953]

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ The request need not always be preceded by some insinuation from the Hon. the Chief Minister. He said it was all dilatory tactics. After all, the Bill has come here only after the dilatory tactics of the Government for so many months. So, why should we consider it dilatory tactics now? ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The House will sit till 5 p.m.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ The Hon. the Chief Minister is always characterizing these things as dilatory tactics. This is not at all dilatory. We know definitely that this is not *his* Bill, whatever may be his opinions. So, let him not suffer from that impression.

“ Now, Sir previously we were given to understand that there would be no discussion. As such, we have not come prepared. If you insist that we should sit now, any important amendment to any important clause that may come up may be postponed.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ There is no important thing.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Difficulty will arise only when we come to the Seventh Schedule relating to division of liabilities and assets.”

* SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM :—“ Sir, I move the following amendment :—

‘ 56. *This House recommends to the Government of India that in order that the Andhra State Act may not in future be assailed from a constitutional angle the amendment to the I Schedule to the Constitution provided for in clause 5 of the Bill may be made by means of regular amendment to the Constitution provided for in the Constitution itself.*’

I shall explain the object of my amendment. The passing of this Bill by the Parliament will lead to some consequential amendments to the Constitution. For this purpose, there is provision under Article 4 (1) of the Constitution. But generally any amendment to the Constitution must be made under Article 368. True, there is provision for making consequential amendments under Article 4 (1) (a). Here, as a result of this amendment, there is an increase in the quantum of representation in Parliament, that is, the number of representatives that can be sent by both Madras and the new Andhra States to the Council of States is increased by three. This comes under Article 368, because the quantum of representation is affected by this amendment. It cannot come under Article 4 (1). Our legal opinion is to the effect that this will come only under Article 368. If, however, the total number of seats is divided between these two States, then it will come under Article 4 (1). But the quantum of representation is increased to the prejudice of the representation of other States. This can be covered only by Article 368 of the Constitution. So,

18th July 1953] [Sri M. Kalyanasundaram]

if any satisfactory clarification is coming forth from the Government, I will not press my amendment. Otherwise, there is no harm in sending it to the Central Government as our views, for their information."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" It is a matter ⁴ p.m. of commonsense. We have to consider whether it is necessary to raise this point in this House or whether we can leave this point to be considered in the House of the People when the Bill is considered there."

* SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM :—" The Hon. Chief Minister wishes to avoid dilatory tactics and that the Bill must be disposed of without delay. If this point was raised at a later stage in the Parliament at Delhi, it will delay the passing of the Andhra State Bill."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Articles 3 and 4 lay down the procedure in respect of the formation of new States. Indeed as a consequence to that, the scale of representation in each State and the quantum of representation may change, because for the first 5 millions there is one scale of representation and thereafter there is another scale of representation. But the maximum fixed for the Council of States is not exceeded now, because, the maximum has not been reached. They can have 40 more, but there is only an increase of 3 contemplated here. We are following the scale of representation laid down in the Constitution itself. As a result of this one State gets three more seats. Therefore, there is no point in the present amendment."

* SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM :—" Anyhow, I am anxious that this point should be conveyed to the Central Government. I am not convinced even after hearing the explanation offered by the Leader of the House. It is true that the number fixed for the Council of States is not exceeded. But the composite Madras State was having a certain number. Any increase is likely to affect the representation of the other Part A and Part B States. Probably it may be an oversight. If this point was raised at a later stage in the Parliament, it will lead to further delay."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" If there was an oversight and it was pointed out here, how does it save time? Ours is only an opinion and not a decision. It is for the House of the People to consider whether there was any oversight and take a decision in the matter. So our considering this matter will not save time. If time is lost, it is lost."

SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM :—" I shall then withdraw my amendment (No. 56)."

The amendment of hon. Member Sri M. Kalyanasundaram was, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

[18th July 1953]

PART III.

Clauses 6 and 7.

(No amendments moved.)

Clause 8.

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ I move the following amendment standing in my name :—

‘ For the words “ shall be deemed to have been elected by the elected members ”, substitute the words “ shall have to be elected by the elected members ”. ’

“ We are elected Members of the composite Madras State Assembly. Now a new State is being carved out. So that State must have fresh elections and fresh Members. If the present Members continued to be in the new Assembly, it will be morally and constitutionally wrong. We are being given life by the Indian Government at the mercy of the Prime Minister or somebody else. Whenever a new State is formed, it must have new Members. When the Provinces of Sind and Orissa were formed, the same thing happened. We are going to have a new State. Andhra State will not be an old State. It will have its life only from 1st October 1953. Before that there is no Andhra State. We are Andhra Members of a composite State. I submit that we must have fresh elections for a new State.”

The amendment was duly seconded.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

‘ For the words “ shall be deemed to have been elected by the elected members ”, substitute the words “ shall have to be elected by the elected members ”. ’ ”

The amendment was put and lost.

Clauses 9, 10, 11 and 12.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ There are no amendments to clauses 9, 10, 11 and 12.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ Amendment No. 60 has been shown in the printed list as amendment to clause 12. It stands in the name of Sri T. N. Venkatasubba Reddi. It is not correct. It is not an amendment to clause 12 and there is no amendment for this clause. It has to be corrected.”

SRI K. KOTI REDDI :—“ Amendment No. 60 standing in the name of Sri T. N. Venkatasubba Reddi has been wrongly shown under clause 12. It is an amendment to clause 12 (2) of the Seventh Schedule.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Probably, it is a printer's devil.”

Clause 13.

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“ Sir, I move the following amendment standing in my name :—

‘ 61. For the words “ shall be deemed to have been elected to the House of the People ”, substitute the words “ shall be elected to the House of the People ”. ’

18th July 1953] [Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah]

I repeat the same argument that I advanced for my amendment to clause 8. As we are going to have a new State, there must be fresh election, in this case also."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Having lost his former amendment, how can the hon. Member press this amendment? Further, his amendment has not been seconded." (Laughter.)

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Sir, there is really no meaning in this amendment. What Mr. Gopalakrishnaiah wants in his amendment is the sitting Members should be elected." 4-10 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER :—" He has got something in his mind but has put it in a different language." (Laughter.)

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—" I shall explain it, Sir. My point is that representatives of the Andhra people must be elected."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" There is no object gained by confusing Mr. Gopalakrishnaiah. What he proposes is that these seats should be vacated and a fresh election should be held. But the amendment reads that the same Members shall be elected by the electorate." (Laughter.)

MR. SPEAKER :—" Is the hon. Member pressing his amendment? "

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—" I am not pressing it."

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER :—" Clause 13 is over. There is no amendment to clause 14. The amendments to clause 15 are not moved. We shall take up clause 16."

Clause 16.

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—" Sir, I move—

64. ' For the words " cease to be a member of the Legislative Assembly of Madras and shall be deemed to have been elected to the Legislative Assembly of Andhra " , substitute the words " cease to be a member of the Legislative Assembly of Madras and shall be elected by the constituency for the Legislative Assembly of Andhra " . '

My point is the word ' deemed ' should be deleted.

" I want that the Members of the Andhra Legislature should be elected afresh from the several constituencies of the new Andhra State and that the present Members of the Madras Legislature should not continue there.

" The popular opinion in Andhra is that the policies, economic development policies, and everything should be decided by the

[18th July 1953]

elected representatives of the new Andhra State. Members from the Madras Legislature have no right to determine the policies of the new Andhra State. There must be fresh election in the Andhra State. The whole political set-up there might change then."

Sri G. C. Kondayya seconded the amendment.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" I oppose the amendment."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

'For the words "cease to be a member of the Legislative Assembly of Madras and shall be deemed to have been elected to the Legislative Assembly of Andhra", substitute the words "cease to be a member of the Legislative Assembly of Madras and shall be elected by the constituency for the Legislative Assembly of Andhra".'

The amendment was put and lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" Clause 16 is disposed of. Clauses 17 and 18 have no amendments. We are on clause 19."

SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM :—" We have disposed of many clauses to-day. We can take up clause 19 on Monday."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I have no objection. But I must tell hon. Members that there is a slight change in the hour of the meeting on Monday. In the agenda circulated already it is stated that the meeting will commence at 9-30 a.m. But now it has been changed to 8-30 a.m.

"I adjourn the House to meet again at 8-30 a.m. on Monday, the 20th July 1953."

The House then adjourned.

வாய்மையே வெல்லும்
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS